



GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND

**Review of Evaluation Studies
and Methodology
followed by
Nagaland State Evaluation Organisation**

**DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND
KOHIMA**

Preface

During the past forty years there has been overall progress in all areas of social concern in the State. Yet the achievements are mixed, with stark contrasts and disparities. The performance of many development programmes has been evaluated by the State Evaluation Department, primarily with reference to their immediate objectives and to identify the factors that have contributed to their success or failures.

However, the evaluation and monitoring system too needs to be re-oriented to suit the needs of the development departments for management of development programmes and to contribute to formulation of effective policies and programmes and quality public spending. Through this report, the undersigned examines the evaluation practices of the State Evaluation Department, including the use of evaluation results by the development/ implementing departments. It analyses and comments on the evaluation process followed for each evaluation study conducted and printed by the Evaluation Department since its inception. It is hoped that this Report will prove beneficial for all technical staff of the State Evaluation Department and other monitoring and evaluation professionals in the State.

Aparna Bhatia, IES
Director,
Directorate of Evaluation

Contents

Background

Section I	The Nagaland State Evaluation Directorate- A Brief Profile
Section II	The Evaluation Studies
Section III	Main Observations regarding Methodology adopted in the Evaluation Studies
3.1	Aspects relating to Methodology
3.2	Aspects relating to Report Writing
3.3	Spread of Evaluation studies
Section IV	The follow up
Section V	The Steering Committee
Section VI	The SWOT Analysis
Section VII	Suggestions and Conclusions
Annexure A	Training received by the ED officers and staff
Annexure B	

Review of Evaluation Studies and Methodology followed by Evaluation Directorate, Government of Nagaland ¹

Background

Evaluation may be defined as the process of assessing the results of a programme to determine whether its stated goals and objectives have been achieved. This process seeks to identify factors related to the performance and effectiveness of the programme, to determine its feasibility, develop solutions to implementation problems and effect improvement in the programme itself. The evaluation process has two aspects: retrospective - were the objectives of the programme achieved, and prospective- what should be done to improve the programme.

The main reasons for evaluation include

- Evaluation tells the administrator whether the programme/scheme is meeting its object in specific areas.
- Evaluation examines whether the benefits of the programme/scheme are reaching the target group of persons (beneficiaries) and whether the programme is having the desired impact.
- It aids policy makers' decision making with regards to the need for changes in the programme implementation, the strengths (or weaknesses) of the implementing officials and the effect of the various programmes.
- Evaluation determines the costs and benefits of a given programme.
- It assesses the programme itself. By providing insight into the programme by reflecting the actual field experience, it plays a vital role in improvement in the future policy and project formulation.
- Evaluation can also be used as a public relations device to demonstrate the worth of a programme/scheme.

In brief, evaluation is a useful instrument to gain information about the past programmes, to offer direction to the programme effort and to facilitate decisions

¹ *Analysis by Mrs. Apama Bhalia, IES, Officer on Special Duty, Department of Planning and Co-ordination, Government of Nagaland in 2000.*

About future programmes. It enables the policy makers, the programme implementers, the professionals and the community to make decisions about the programme, once the results of the programme implementation are known. It enables decisions regarding the strategy for the future - should the coverage be expanded or reduced, should the programme be abolished and replaced by a new programme, what new strategy should be planned for the future. Thus, evaluation may be the final point in the implementation of the programme or the starting point for future activities.

A study into the methodology adopted by the Nagaland State Evaluation Directorate was undertaken at the instance of the Development Commissioner, Department of Planning and Co-ordination, Government of Nagaland. The reports on the evaluation studies, carried out by the Evaluation Directorate and its district offices, were examined. The approach adopted was reviewed to ascertain/suggest modifications required in the methodology and the working of the Evaluation Steering Committee.

Section I

The Nagaland State Evaluation Directorate - A Brief Profile

The Evaluation Organisation was set-up on 14th October 1968 in the form of Evaluation Unit in the Planning and Co-ordination department, with one Evaluation Officer and one Investigator. It was subsequently upgraded to a Directorate with seven District Evaluation Offices at Kohima, Mokokchung, Tuensang, Phek, Wokha, Mon, and Zunheboto. The Development Commissioner is ex-officio, the Director of Evaluation Directorate. The staff strength of the Directorate consists of forty persons at the headquarters and forty-nine persons at the district offices.

Sanctioned staff strength of the Directorate and its field Offices

A. The Evaluation Directorate

B. District Evaluation Offices

<i>Sanctioned Posts</i>		<i>Sanctioned Posts</i>	
1. Director (Ex officio)	1	1. District Evaluation Officer	1
2. Joint Director	1	2. Evaluation Inspector	2
3. Deputy Director	1	3. Computer	1
4. Assistant Director	3	4. Establishment staff	3
5. Evaluation officer	1	Total	7
6. Computer/ Compiler	3		
7. Registrar/ Superintendent & other establishment staff	23		
Total	40	Total staff strength in 7 districts	49

(Dimapur district does not have a Distt. Evaluation Office)

The Evaluation Directorate functions under the general guidelines of the *Evaluation Steering Committee*. The Evaluation Steering committee consists of the following² -

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| i. The Development Commissioner | Chairman |
| ii. Secretary Finance Department | Member |
| iii. Joint Secretary, P&AR Department | Member |
| iv. Director, Vigilance Commissioner
Principal/Commissioner & Secy./Secy. and the Head
of the Department whose report is being discussed. | Member v.
Co-opted Members |
| vi. O.S.D. Planning | Member |
| vii. Joint Director, Evaluation | Member Secretary |

The Steering Committee decides the schemes on which the Evaluation studies are to be undertaken, guides and directs regarding the approach, methodology, etc for evaluation of different schemes, approves the Evaluation reports for publication and assesses the follow up actions taken by the departments as suggested in the Evaluation reports.

'As reconstituted on 6th September 2000.

Section II

The Evaluation Studies

Since its establishment in 1968. The Evaluation Branch/Directorate has undertaken and published forty-two studies. The studies can broadly be classified into three groups

1. State level evaluation of schemes/programmes undertaken by Evaluation Directorate, Kohima. These are concurrent evaluation of on going programmes. A random sample is taken to cover a few representative districts. These studies aim to study the impact of the programme, physical and financial appraisal and related issues. These include evaluation studies on ICDS, TRYSEM, IRDP, VDB Programme, etc.

2. Appraisal of certain works which are still under construction. These studies have also been undertaken by the Evaluation Directorate. These include Evaluation reports on Doyang Hydro Electric Project in Wokha, Wazeho mini cement plant in Phek, Likimro Hydro Electric Project, Indira Gandhi Stadium complex in Kohima and Referral Hospital at Dimapur. The scope of these studies is limited to the construction aspects. They attempt to assess the progress of the construction works, examine the problems, difficulties and related issues and suggest ways and means for successful completion of the project. The evaluation staff is competent to undertake a verification of the progress of the projects, that too in a non-partisan manner, as they are not associated (and therefore unbiased) to the concerned departments. Thus, the utilisation of the services of the evaluation staff for the appraisal of the projects still under construction is an instrument for optimum utilisation of the evaluation staff and also getting an accurate assessment of the projects under construction.

3. District level analysis of certain schemes undertaken by the District Evaluation Offices. An encouraging aspect of such studies is that they represent the interest/ proactive approach of the District Planning & Development Boards in the concurrent assessment of the schemes by the evaluation office. This was especially observed in the case of Phek and Zunheboto District Planning & Development Boards.

A list of publications along with details such as year of study and the evaluation agency as under.

TABLE I**LIST OF THE EVALUATION STUDIES UNDERTAKEN BY DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION**

Publication	Name of the Study	Year of Publication	Evaluation carried out by
1	Current Evaluation Report on Khandasari Sugar Project Dimapur and Sugarcane Development programme in the State of Nagaland.	1973	Evaluation Directorate
2	Evaluation report on the impact of block Development programme in Nagaland	1975	Evaluation Directorate
3	Report on Evaluation Study of Medium Sized Seed Farms at Merapani	1976	Evaluation Directorate
4	Report on Evaluation Study of Changki Valley Fruit Preservation & Canning	1976	Evaluation Directorate
5	Snap Evaluation Report on Key Village Scheme in Nagaland	1976	Evaluation Directorate
6	Evaluation Report on Government Sales Emporium in Nagaland	1979	Evaluation Directorate
7	Evaluation Report on Primary Health Centres (PHCs) in Nagaland	1979	Evaluation Directorate
8	Evaluation Report on Industrial Estate at Dimapur	1980	Evaluation Directorate
9	Evaluation Report on Elementary Education in Nagaland.	1936	Evaluation Directorate
10	Evaluation Report on Government Workshop Organisation in Nagaland	1986	Evaluation Directorate
11	Evaluation Report on Integrated Rural Development programme (IRDP)	1986	Evaluation Directorate
12	Report on the Evaluation Study of Rural Water Supply in Nagaland	1986	Evaluation Directorate
13	Evaluation Study of poultry Farm at Mokokchung	1967	Evaluation Directorate
14	Report on Village Development Boards (VDB) Programme in Phek District	1987	Evaluation Directorate
15	Evaluation Study of Poultry Farm at Dimapur	1987	Evaluation Directorate
16	Evaluation Report on piggery Breeding Farm in Nagaland	1989	Evaluation Directorate
17	Evaluation report on IRDP in Zunheboto district of Nagaland	1990	District Evaluation Office. Zunheboto.
18	Evaluation Report on IRDP In Phek District	1992	District Evaluation Office. Phek.
19	A quick Evaluation Study report on TRYSEM (SRDA) in Mokokchung District	1992	District Evaluation Office. Mokokchung.
20	Valuation Report on VDB Programme in Wokha District of Nagaland.	1992	District Evaluation Office. Wokha.
21	Evaluation Report on VDB Programme in Kohima District of Nagaland.	1992	Evaluation Directorate
22	Evaluation Report on Integrated Child Development Scheme in Nagaland	1992	Evaluation Directorate
23	Evaluation Report on IRDP in Tuesang district of Nagaland	1996	District Evaluation Office. Tuesang.
24	Evaluation report on coffee plantation Scheme in Phek district	1996	District Evaluation Office. Phek.
25	Evaluation Report on PHCs in Phek district	1996	Evaluation Directorate Phek
26	A quick Evaluation Report on the Doyang Hydro Electric Project In Wokha district	1996	Evaluation Directorate
27	A quick Evaluation Report on the Wazeho Mini Cement Plant in Phek district	1996	Evaluation Directorate
28	Evaluation Report on VDBs programme in Mokokchung district of Nagaland	1955	District Evaluation Office. Mokokchung.
29	Evaluation Report on Schools in Phek town	1997	District Evaluation Office. Phek.
30	Evaluation Report on referral Hospital at Dimapur	1998	Evaluation Directorate
31	A Quick concurrent Evaluation Study Report on Likimro Hydro Electric Project	1998	Evaluation Directorate
32	Evaluation Study Report on Fair price Shop in Zunheboto district	1999	District Evaluation Office. Zunheboto.
33	Evaluation Report on Nutrition Programme in Phek district	1999	District Evaluation Office. Phek.
34	Evaluation Report on a Survey on Rural Savings and its Utilisation Mon district	1999	District Evaluation Office. Mon.
35	A quick Evaluation Study report on Soil & Water Conservation Programme in Zunheboto	2000	District Evaluation Office. Zunheboto.
36	Evaluation Report on Immunisation of Children Programme in Nagaland.	2000	Evaluation Directorate
37	Evaluation Study Report on sericulture development programme in Zunheboto district	2000	District Evaluation Office. Zunheboto.
38	Snap Evaluation Report on Indira Gandhi Stadium Complex at Kohima	2000	Evaluation Directorate
39	Evaluation Report on Horticulture Research Farm at Pftusero	2000	District Evaluation Office, Phek.
40	Evaluation Report on Regional Rabbit Breeding production farm in	2000	Evaluation Directorate
41	Evaluation Report on Regional Rabbit Breeding Product Mon Farm in	2000	Evaluation Directorate
42	Evaluation Report on Horticulture Development Programme in Wokha	2003	District Evaluation Office, Wokha.

Section III

Main observations regarding the Methodology adopted in the Evaluation studies.

The scheme wise comments on the Evaluation study are detailed in Table II

TABLE II
A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY ADOPTED IN THE EVALUATION STUDIES

Name of the Study 1	Year 2	Reference Period 3	Sample size 4	Methodology/instruments 5	Districts under study 6	Objectives	Limitations 8	Remarks by Author 9
1. Current Evaluation Report on Khandsari Sugar Project Dimapur and Sugarcane Development Programme in the State of Nagaland.	Sept. 1970	3years {1967-68 to 1969-70}	Khandsari Sugar Project.	1. Schedule (sch.) for Sugar Project. 2. Sen. for Sugar Cane growers.	Dimapur (Kohima)	To study various aspects of factoring of the Khandsari sugar Mill and find its impact on the Psychology the sugarcane growers.		1. The study has a detailed analysis of the investments by the govt., expenditure incurred & returns thereof. Analysis of the management & training is very well done. 2. The only report where the questionnaires have been attached to the report and where the time dimension (field work, etc.) has been clearly mentioned, giving a time framework to the field findings. 3. Very accurate predictions made about the then yet to be started sugar mill which have since come Sue.
2. Evaluation Report on the impact of Block Development Programmes in Nagaland	June 1969.	15 years (1953-54 to 1976-68)	5 Blocks (out of total 15), 10 villages, 70 respondents.		All 3 districts	To study awareness of people, adoption of improved methods of agri, examine availability of various socio economic facilities & impact of the Block programmes.	1. Lack of basic data regarding and utilisation, cropping pattern at respondents level. 2. Lack of direct communication due to ignorance of local dialect.	1. Stale level analysis has been done. 2. Good financial analysis. Expenditure analysed against outlays to examine whether expenditure was productive. 3. Deptt. 's comments are not there, but were sought/ received before the publication of the report.
3. Report on Evaluation Study of Medium Sized Seed Farms at Merapani	1975	6 years {1968-69 to 1973-74}	Merapani Seed Farm	1. Detailed Farm Sch. 2. Brief respondents Sch.	Mokokchung (now Wokha)	Appraisal of physical & financial performance of the seed farm, analyse bottlenecks & suggestions for economic viability.	Paucity of adequate data & gaps in farm records.	1, Well done detailed analysis. 2. Comments sought from the agriculture deptt. and are attached along with.

4. Report on Evaluation Study of Changki Valley Fruit Preservation & Canning factor at Longnak	1975	7 years (1965-66 to 1971-72)	Fruit Preservation & Canning Factory.	No questionnaires used.	Mokokchung	Case study to assess the progress in the state's maiden fruit preservation venture & its impact on fruit growers.	1. Absence of year wise data on horticulture schemes. 2. Lack of land survey or horticulture survey.	Very well written introduction. Analysis too detailed.
5. Snap Evaluation Report on Key Village Scheme in Nagaiand	1976	6 years (1969-70 to 1974-75)	One Key Block (Dmr), 3 Key Villages, 23 Centres.	Snap study on complete enumeration basis.	Dmr (Kma), Mkg, Tsg.	Appraisal of the scheme, problems faced, weak points, suggestions for up gradation of programme.	Lack of annual! fixed targets. So the actual physical target cannot be critically examined.	1. No analysis of financial outlay/ expenditure of each KV/KVCLS. Centre. No critical analysis of qualitative achievements, lacunae of scheme, etc. 2. The respondents for primary data not specified & ambiguous.
6. Evaluation Report on Government Sales Emporium in Nagaiand.	1979	5 years (1969-70 to 1973-74)	All 3 emporia in the state; 15%artisans, 55%entrepreneurs, 60% prdn centres, 50% coop. Societies.	1. Emporium level Sch. 2. Artisans entrepreneur Sch.	Kma, Mkg., Tsg.	Study workings progress of sales emporia, analyse problems & give suggestions for functional efficiency.		Comments of the concerned deptt. have been sought Attached along with. Analysis is done well.
7. Evaluation Report on Primary Health Centres (PHCs) in Nagaland	1980	8 years (1969-70 to 1976-77)	4 (out of 11) PHCs; 2 (out of 45) SCs. 60 Respondents	LPHC & SC Sch. 2. Respondents (general public) sch.	Kma (& Dmr), Mkg, Zbto	Assess progress, working, impact, shortcomings; suggest measures for their removal	Non-availability of the required data from the implementing agency.	A critical & comprehensive study covering all aspects. Analysis of beneficiary response done well. Comments of Din Health Service included, representing views of the evaluated body. 2. Non availability financial data, hence no analysis of financial performance of PHCs.
8. Evaluation Report on Industrial Estate at Dimapur	1983	9 years (1971-72 to 1979-80)	All working units in the Estate.	1. State Sch. for Din (Industries) 2. Sch. for Indust Estate for NIDC, 3. Sch. for individual entrepreneur	Dimapur (Kma)	Assess progress, impact (in terms of attracting new small scale entrepreneurs) & highlight problems.	Absence of systematic maintenance of records.	1. No analysis regarding break up of expenditure & its productive/ unproductive utilisation. 2. One separate chapter should be there before findings to detail the responses to the various schedules.

9. Evaluation Report on Elementary Education in Nagaland.	1986	8 years (1971-72 to 1978-79)	3 Blocks out of 21, 16 Schools, 88 teachers	Sch A-School level data Sch B-School! Management Committee/ Board SchC-Headmaster/ teachers SchD-Parents	Kma, Zbto. Mon.	Progress, conditions & arrangements, impact ^problems; suggest remedial measures.		1. Study done at the instance of the Dev. Commissioner, but the objectives of the study & reference period as desired by the Planning Deptt. have not been examined. 2. Programmes of education not mentioned all.
								3. Inadequate financial analysis. Well-done, comprehensive qualitative analysis but it remains subjective without correlation with financial aspect, i.e., the level of physical achievement at what level of expenditure to the government. Very comprehensive analysis of performance of the schools.
10. Evaluation Report on Government Workshop Organisation in Nagaland	1983	16 years (1966-67 to 1981-82)	All 3 government work shops	Sch. For Workshop/ Mechanical Engineer's office	Kma, Mkg., Tsg.	Appraise working, study problems, whether economic ally viable; how the staff can be utilised if wound up	1. Staff not there in office; come only on payday 2. Up to date & systematic office records not maintained	Financial analysis done. Administrative issues tackled. Suggestions practical & implementable.
11. Evaluation Report on Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)	1986	1 year. (1982-83)	7 Blocks (out of 21); 10% beneficiaries of '82-83	No questionnaires used.	All districts	Assess progress, working, impact and problems. Suggest remedial measures.	Absence of and records & income survey. Non co-operation of the R. D. Deptt.	An adhoc study without analysis of financial aspects, percapita assistance. Unsubstantiated findings and lack of report on the field experience. Absence of state/ district level analysis.
12. Report on the Evaluation Study of Rural Water Supply in Nagaland	1986	7 years. (1975-76 to 1981-82)	One village, 10 respondents	SchA for Exec. Engg. PHE Sch B for SDO (PHE) SchC for beneficiaries.	Jalukie 'B' village. (Kma)	Appraisal of financial & physical performance; impact & problems; suggest remedial		A pilot study covering one village & one scheme.
13. Evaluation Study of Poultry Format Mokokchung	Copy of the Report not available, hence not analysed							

14. Report on Village Development Boards (VDB) Programme in Phek District	1987	3 years. 0980-81 to 1982-33)	Phek Block, 10 villages (outof46)	Multiple Hypotheses developed and tested through observation and interviews.	Phek	Study the performance & impact of VDBs knowledge & People's participation, level of assistance by govt; remedial measures.		Part of a state level analysis of the programme. A detailed study where most of the aspects have been examined. Well thought out objectives, hypotheses & key indicators. Analysis of the programme exceptionally well done.
15. Evaluation Study of Poultry. Farm at Dmapur.	Cop of the Report not available, hence no Analysed							
16. Evaluation Report on Piggery Breeding Farms in Nagaiand.	1989	3 years. (1980-81 to 1982-83}	3 State breeding farms out of 6	Farm level Schedule	Mkg., Tsg, Zbto.	Study organisational structure, activities, financial aspect, prodn. training, other aspects; remedial measures.	Lack of manpower. Therefore impact of Piggery development programme not examined.	No mention of various schemes under implementation. Analysis of the three farm and their functioning well done. However, no description of the other three farms at all.
17. Evaluation Report on IRDP in Zunheboto district of Nagaland	1989	3 years 0335-86 to 1987-83)	AH 3 Blocks, 10 villages (out of 155)	No questionnaires used.	Zunheboto	Study conditions & arrangements, progress & problems. Suggest remedial measures.		1. Study on IRDP undertaken by Evaluation Directorate in 1986(SI No. 11) & DEO, Phek (S No 19) using similar methodology for uniformity in evaluation & for extention/ cross checking of the analysis. 2. Comments of RD deptt. have been taken & are a good reflection on certain arbitrariness of the study.

18. Evaluation Report on IRDP in Phek District	1989	3 years (1985-86 to 1987-88)	All 3 Blocks, 12 villages, 84 Beneficiaries	No questionnaires used.	Phek	Study progress & impact. Analyse the prog. & suggest measures to improve organisational & functional efficiency.	1. Absence of land records & income survey. 2. Lack of manpower & transport facilities.	1, No mention of SI No 11 & 18. A follow-up of the 1986 report could have been undertaken simultaneously. 2. A well-done study using direct & indirect indicators to study the effectiveness of the implementation of IRDP. However, financial analysis is lacking.
19. A quick Evaluation Study report on TRYSEM (SRDA) in Mokokchung District	1990	4 years (1986-87 to 1989-90)	45 trainees out of 45	Questionnaire for TRYSEM trainees.	Mokokchung	At the instance of DPDB to assess the present status of the trainees & to see whether the training helped them in getting	Lack of transport facilities.	
20. Evaluation Report on VDB Programme in Wokha District of Nagaland.	1991	3 years (1985-86 to 1987-88)	1 Block, 5 villages, 50 respondents	Sen I for Secy VDB Sch II for the villagers	Wokha	Study the performance & impact of VDBs; knowledge & people's participation, level of assistance by govt; remedial measures.	Absence of proper official records.	Part of the Distt. wise evaluation study of VDB P programme to be carried out in all distts. The methodology, analysis and findings of all the VDB studies is similar. A consolidated study of all districts would have been enlightening.
21. Evaluation Report on VDS Programme in Kohima - District of Nagaland.	1991	3 years (1985-86 to 1987-88)	1 Block, 5 villages, 50 respondents	Sch for Secy VDB Sch II for the villagers	Kohima	Study the performance & impact of VDBs; knowledge & people's participation, level of assistance by govt; remedial measures.	Lack of records.	-do-
22. Evaluation Report on Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) in Nagaland	1991	3 years (1986-87 to 1988-89)	3 Project centres, 13 Anganwadi centres, 65 parents/ respondents	1. State level Sen. 2. ICDS Project level sch, 3. Anganwadi level Sch. 4. Beneficiary level Sch.	Kma, Dmr., Phek.	Study working of the programme & activities & impact of the centres, suggestions for effective implementation.	Lack of maintenance of records.	Only study with a state level schedule, along with stratified (multi level) Schedules. The best study in terms of analysis, methodology and report writing.
23. Evaluation Report on IRDP in Tuensang district of Nagaland	1986	3 years (1985-86 to 1987-88)	5(out of 7) Blocks, 10 villages, 50 beneficiaries		Tuensang	Study working, impact, shortcomings; suggest remedial measures.		1. At the instance of the DPDB. 2. IRDP is a credit-based scheme. Without reflection of financial aspect the report is not

								complete. 3. No mention of the 3 other IRDP studies undertaken. 4. Hundred respondents interviewed. Schedule could have been used for uniformity.
24. Evaluation Report on Coffee Plantation Scheme in Phek district	1992	5years. (1985-86 to 1989-90)	8 villages (out of 38) & 2 towns (out of 3)	Sch. A for Beneficiaries Sch. B for implementing agency	Phek	Study progress, impact, problems. Suggest remedial measures.	Data based on the verbal-estimation of illiterate beneficiaries.	Both direct & indirect indicators used well as instruments of analysis. Well thought out tables which explain the actual position of the scheme.
25. Evaluation Report on PHCs in Phek district	1992	2years. (1988-89 to 1989-90)	2PHCs, 2SCs, 15 respondents	Sch I for PHCs & SCs Sch II for the general public/beneficiaries	Phek	Assess the working, progress, impact, shortcomings & suggest remedial measures.	1. Absence of "readily available" official records. 2. Non availability of financial data - fin. Performance not analysed.	At the instance of DPDB. Snap study on the physical performance of PHCs. Evaluation Directorate study on PHCs in 1980 (SI No 7) Some mention of the study and comparative analysis of the findings for the then 3 sampled districts and Phek could have been there for a wider analysis.
26. A quick Evaluation Report on the Doyang Hydro Electric Project in Wokha district	1993	Point Analysis 1993	Doyang Hydro Electric Project	A short questionnaire for the plant	Wokha	Assess progress, targets & achievements & problems in construction & miscellaneous inter related issues.	Report to be completed in 20 days time.	1. Short & crisp report which indicates the ground reality. Adequate within the given objectives of the study & limited time framework. 2. Strong allegations against ADC in the report. Some comments of Distt. Admn. Should have been sought for fixation of responsibility/ intervention by AG for financial verification.
27. A quick Evaluation Report on the Wazeho Mini Cement Plant in Phek district in Naqaland	-	Point Analysis	Wazeho Mini Plant		Phek	Brief observations about the project activities.	Report to be submitted within two weeks.	A sketchy report where no methodology/eval tools are apparently used. The complete lack of time dimension is a major ambiguity.

28. Evaluation Report on VDBs Programme in Mokokchung district of Nagaiand	1993	3 years. (1985-86 to 1987-88)	1 Block, 5 villages, 50 respondents	Sen I for Secy VDBSchi! for the villagers	Mokokchung	Study the performance & impact of VDBs; knowledge & people's participation, level of assistance by govt; remedial measures.		Part of all distt. Analysis. But no mention/ analysis of the studies as undertaken in other distts.
29. Evaluation Report on Schools in Phek town		Point Analysis	Cent per cent survey (7schools)	Sch I for school authorities Sen II for students	Phek	Assess progress, conditions & arrangements, impact & problems. Suggest measures		Indicators for analysis well thought out & explained well. Explanation of tabulated findings also there. No mention of time dimension- when the study/field tours conducted This is especially relevant for qualitative tables (findings as on what date) as it is a point analysis & also for future reference.
30. Evaluation Report on Referral Hospital at Dimapur	1995	Point Analysis June 1995	Referral Hospital Dimapur	Questionnaire & records	Dimapur (Kma;	Realistic appraisal of the progress of construction & its problems.	Problem reconciling of systematizing data.	Detailed analysis regarding the progress of the project. Specified that progress is as on 31.3.95. Some comments should have been sought for gross mismanagement of finances. Further verification from AG required.
31. A Quick concurrent Evaluation Study Report on Likimro Hydro Electric Project	1995	5years. (1991-92 to 1995-98)	Likimro H E Project	Questionnaire & records	Tuensang	Assess physical progress, remaining works, achievements, problems S inter related issues.		Financial mis-utilisation very well highlighted but inadequate without comments of the deptt & fixation of responsibility.

32. Evaluation Study Report on Fair Price Shop in Zunheboto district	1996	2 years. (1988-89 to 1989-90)	6CPOoutof9	"Especially designed schedule*	Zunheboto	Study working, implementation & impact, suggest measures for improvement.	Lack conveyance & shortage of staff.	At the instance of Distt, Planning & Development Board. Analysis sketchy & inadequate.
33. Evaluation Report on Nutrition Programme in Phek district	1996	3 years. (1990-91 to 1992-93)	All 4 Blocks, 26 respondents	Sch I for CDPOS Supervisor Sch 11 for Anganwagi workers Sch III for genl. public	Phek	Assess progress, impact & shortcomings, suggest measures for improvement.	Non availability of financial data- financial performance of the scheme not attempted.	At the instance of DPBD. ICDS study also undertaken by Evaluation Directorate in 1991 (SI No22), which included Phek. The study should have been referred to & the analysis in terms of follow-up on earlier study undertaken. Summary & Conclusions of the study missing in the report
34. Evaluation Report on a Survey on Rural Savings and its Utilisation in Mon District		1 year (1992-93)	one village, 11 respondents/ households	Household interview schedule	Mon	Study socio economic profile, sources of income & small savings. Access future saving potential.	1. Lack of staff Slack of conveyance. 2. Information not based on records.	At the instance of DPDB. Sample size too small (11 persons) to be called a survey. Though the indicators are well thought out, the percentages are irrelevant & misleading representatives of Block/ Distt. No analysis has been attempted. Assessment of future saving potential not there.
35. A quick Evaluation Study report on Soil & Water Conservation Programme in Zunheboto District	1997	1 year(1993-94)	3 areas (out of 8), 3 towns/villages (1 from each area), 19 beneficiaries.	1. Distt. Level Sch. 2. Beneficiary level sch.	Zunheboto	Study working, impact & suggest measures.		At the instance of the DPDB. Analysis only of selection of the beneficiaries & distn. of subsidy. The study indicates gross financial irregularities. Some follow-up/comments

								should have been there from the deptt t
36. Evaluation Report on Immunisation of Children Programme in Nagaland.	1997	4 years. (1992-93 to 1995-96)	All 7 distts, 70 villages, 700beneficiaries/HH, 70 VCChairmen/TCmembers	1. State level sch. 2. Respondentst level sch. 3.vccrrsch.	All Districts.	Study working of the programme, progress S bottle necks. Suggest measures for effective implementation.	Lack of own vehicle (of the evaluation team)	A well done 8 detailed study with a large representative sample covering ail the distts.
37. Evaluation Study Report on Sericulture Development Programme in Zunheboto district	1997	2 years (1994-95 to 1995-96)	3Blocks(outof 6), 22 beneficiaries	Sch I Distt. Level Sch II Farm level Sch 111 Beneficiary level	Zunheboto	Assess working, impact & suggest measures.	Non availability of beneficiary level data due to lack of maintenance of records by the beneficiaries.	At the instance of DPDB. Many aspects of financial irregularities(beneficiaries given less money than mentioned in records)- comments of Deptt. /Block level officials should have been collected.
38. Snap Evaluation Report on Indira Gandhi Stadium Complex at Kohima	1998	Point Analysis	IGS Complex	Questionnaire & records	Kohima	Study construction aspects & suggest ways of successful completion & smooth functioning of the stadium.	Report within 10 days time.	At the instance of Cabinet Sub Committee headed by Sh Obed & Minister (Planning & Co-ordination). A short study which meets the requirements of the objectives of the study and time period of 10 days.
39. Evaluation Report on Horticulture Research Farm at Pfüterero	1998	30 years (1964-65 to 1995-96)	Horticulture Research Farm	Questionnaire & records	Phek	Assess working & short comings of the farm & suggest measures for removing them.	1. Records of earlier yrs not maintained. 2. Impact of the farm has not been attempted in the study.	At the instance of DPDB. Not really a three decade study but a single year (1995) study as the earlier data is not examined. Working of the farm well explained. Indicators well thought of and explained/ analysed well.
4U. impact bvaluation Report ot Family Health Awareness Week Programme in Nagaland	1999	One week	One distt (out of 2), 5PHCs/CHCs, 15 camps/ villages, 10male&FHW, 150 respondents	questionnaire & interviews	Kohima	Evaluate the impact of the week long Family Health & AIDS Awareness programme.	Impact of the farm excluded from the purview of the study.	A quick impact evaluation report. Commendable selection of indicators & tabulation of data. Suggestions & conclusions attempted

								with great insight & with meaningful suggestions.
41. Evaluation Report on Regional Rabbit Breeding Production Farm in Nagaland.	1999	3 years (1996-97 to 1998-99)	Rabbit Breeding Center	Farm level Schedule	Dimapur	Study activities, financial aspect & demonstration prog, of the farm, prodn, & distn. of sows & suggest remedial measures.	Inability of the deptt. / eval. Team to trace out the beneficiaries.	The study lacks indepth analysis.
42. Evaluation Report on Horticulture Development Programme in Wokha District.	1999	3 years (1995-96 to 1997-98)	12 villages(out of 21), 131 respondents.	Interview technique	Wokha	Study working, impact, adequacy of funds & supplies Smuggest remedial measures		Financial aspects of various schemes also examined. The only report which has referred(even if only in passing) a success story of the programme in the district.

NOTE:

- i. Limitations mentioned are as experienced by the evaluation team, and thus mentioned in the report.
- ii. Sch. Stands for Schedule, the especially constructed questionnaires for the evaluation purposes.
- iii. PDB stands for District Planning & Development Board.
- iv. ED reffers to Evaluation Directorate, Kohima.
- v. DEO stands for District Evaluation Office.
- vi. Remarks mentioned are observations of the author, while examining the methodology and reports.

The main aspects regarding the methodology and report writing which emerge from these studies are:

3.1 Aspects relating to the Methodology

1. A glance at the objectives of the studies (Table II, Column 7) shows that the **formulation of objectives** is not given the attention it deserves. The objectives are actually the guidelines of the course/path that the evaluation is supposed to undertake. They should constitute the questions whose answers are sought through the evaluation exercise. In most of the studies, the objectives have been stated in a routine manner, i.e., study the progress, working, impact and problems of the programme and suggest remedial measures.

Non formulation of specific objectives leads to differences in perception between the officials at whose instance the evaluation is conducted and the evaluating officials on the one hand, and between the different members of the evaluation team on the other hand. It introduces an element of subjectivity to the analysis and reduces the uniformity of the evaluation.³ Secondly all the aspects are not evaluated. For example, the objective progress and working of the programme includes both financial and physical progress. However, financial analysis of most programmes is inadequate. Working also includes the monitoring, supervision, and public awareness about the scheme, which too has been inadequately examined. Similarly, problems include problems in implementation of the programme by the implementing office at the field — this too has not been examined in any evaluation study.

The most striking example being the Evaluation study on Elementary Education in Nagaland. See Table H, SI. No. 9, Col 9. The objectives and the reference period of the study as sought by the Planning Department vary from those of the Evaluation Directorate.

2. Leaving aside the first ten studies, the **reference period** has been observed to be generally two to three years. Maximum observed is five years, except for two studies. However no trend analysis of a scheme or impact assessment can accurately be made on the basis of two to three years data. It is suggested that the reference period should be at least five years (unless the scheme is under implementation for a lesser period) for a proper temporal analysis.

3. The sampling technique: The Evaluation Directorate has in most cases, leaving aside three cases", analysed the programme/scheme by taking a sample of three districts, or less. Similarly, in the case of State level analysis, undertaken by the DEOs, generally one (out of three or four) Blocks have been the basis of analysis. Though a representative sample is adequate for evaluating a programme, keeping in mind the wide diversity among different districts (culture, economic development, connectivity and accessibility) and the presence of DEOs in seven districts of the state, taking a wider sample would be more appropriate and accurate. In the case of state level analysis, the sample could include all (or most of) the districts for getting a true picture of the implementation of the programme. This can be achieved by involving all the DEOs in the field tours and collection of primary data. In the case of district level analysis, undertaken by a District Evaluation Office, atleast half of the blocks (if possible, all the blocks) should be part of the sample.

There appears to be some misconception regarding the role of sampling in the evaluation studies. In most of the studies, the sample districts and blocks are selected and a random/purposive sample of five to ten villages is drawn as a sample for field investigations. The analysis of these sampled villages is very well done in many studies. **But, there is no analysis of the district or block as a whole.** As the evaluation is conducted for Nagaland State or a particular district as *a whole*, therefore, some analysis (of physical and financial achievements) of the working of the programme in the state/district as a whole should be there. **A sample is drawn on the assumption that a randomly drawn sample represents the entire population** (Nagaland or a particular district). This is because the field analysis of the entire area where the scheme is under implementation is a very time consuming and expensive project. The village analysis is not a substitute for the state or district analysis. The analysis of the villages corroborates findings for the state/district and isolates and discusses factors hindering/facilitating the implementation of the programme at grass root level.

⁴ *Publication No. 2,11 and 36*

4. Impact assessment is a very relevant aspect of the evaluation process. In most of the reports, the analysis of the impact of the programme, improvement in the income, selection of the beneficiaries has been well done. In many studies direct and indirect indicators have been used for impact assessment. Evaluation reports on PHCs in Nagaland, VDB programme in Phek, IRDP in Phek, ICDS in Nagaland, Coffee Plantation in Phek, Impact Evaluation of Family Awareness Week programme are noteworthy in this regard. However, it needs to be stressed that the financial aspect is the integral point of reference which should not be ignored (i.e., the level of impact and achievement is at what expenditure level to the government).

5. The stress on financial aspects in the evaluation studies is inadequate. The utilisation of the resources, i.e. the financial target and achievement at the state level, district level and block level must be attempted in order to examine whether the State's resources are properly utilised. Even if the data is not available at the micro level (block and village), the analysis at the macro level (state and district) should always be done.

The financial analysis should include the following:

- The source and pattern of finance of the scheme, i.e. Govt, of India or Govt, of Nagaland or both and in what ratio. It should be mentioned whether it is plan or non plan scheme.
- The allocation for the state for each of the reference years, or since the onset of the **programme**.
- The annual district wise, block wise allocation along with the name of the district office handling the expenditure.

- The year-wise expenditure at state, district, block level, if possible the village level.
- Analysis of the heads of expenditure with the aim to examine the productivity of the expenditure.
- The flow of resources and expenditure. If the funds are being received in a Single installment at the end of the financial year, the expenditure is not likely to be very judiciously utilised as expenditure on the scheme, resulting in cent percent financial achievement and nominal physical achievement.
- In the case of credit, employment or subsidy related programmes (eg TRYSEM, IRDP, NRY etc) the per capita subsidy reaching the beneficiary should be examined with reference to a) the total expenditure incurred by the govt, on the scheme and actually reaching the target group,) subsidy envisaged under the scheme and actually, and c) the actual earnings of the persons employed.

Except for mention of target and actual expenditure in a few studies, the above financial analysis has not been undertaken in any evaluation study.

The financial achievements should be correlated with the physical achievement and a type of cost-benefit analysis undertaken at a per capita level i.e., what is the level of physical achievement at the full (or near cent per cent) utilisation of funds. This would indicate how productively the govt, resources have been utilised.

In case of data availability, analysis can also be undertaken in terms of equating the amount of government expenditure with the number of beneficiaries and calculating the average benefit received per household/ person.

6. The main limitation experienced by the evaluation teams in most of the schemes is inadequate data. **Lack of maintenance of records** is a major characteristic that emerges from the studies across different departments, schemes and districts.

The lack of records, though a major bottleneck for a detailed and accurate analysis, should not be taken as the starting point in the evaluation process. The department utilising the funds under a scheme is required by the Govt, of India as well as Govt, of Nagaland to maintain a record of the finances and financial & physical achievements of the programme. It should be determined whether the records really don't exist or it is so claimed to avoid in depth evaluation. For example, it can be investigated whether the department (at the State/ headquarter level) sends weekly/ monthly/quarterly/annual progress reports to the Government of India or Government of Nagaland (Planning Department) regarding resource utilisation or achievement of targets. If so, what is the source (i.e. database) of those reports if no records are maintained. Thus, if there is state level record, the officials should be asked to give the district level bifurcation, and the block level bifurcation. Alternately, if no records are maintained (or collected) at the field level, the headquarters officials should be asked to explain the source of the consolidated records (physical & financial achievements) at the district and state level which they submit to higher authorities for fund allocation.

The lack of maintenance of records to a great extent implicitly indicates the mystification of funds or the mismanagement of the scheme, and it should be thus treated in the analysis.

7. The following aspects have **not been examined** in the studies (or discussed in the report).

a. Maintenance of records: Whether the departments and its field offices are maintaining records about the various schemes under implementation, the beneficiaries, the financial & physical aspects, periodic meetings, etc. This aspect has been discussed in detail in serial number 6 above.

b. Monitoring: Does the headquarter or the district officials carry out periodic monitoring of their subordinate staff to supervise their working and the implementation of the programmes. An analysis of the periodicity of monitoring/ tours specified by the govt /department against the *actual* frequency of visits, review meetings and supervision. Secondly, what other instruments of monitoring are expected to be used and are actually being used- for example, quarterly/ monthly/weekly progress reports to the district or state headquarters, target and achievement schedules, field tour reports, etc.

Such an analysis would throw light on the performance of the officials and their field staff, which is also a reflection on their performance as implementers of the schemes/ programmes. The analysis would also provide ideas/alternatives to the Secretary of the concerned Department for a more rigid/tight control on the district, block or village level staff.

c. Training: An analysis of the level of technical qualification and training of the field level officials has also not been undertaken. It has not been examined whether the implementing staff is aware of the nuances and different aspects of the scheme, whether they have received any on the job training, attended any refresher courses/workshop on the programme. The degree of trust the target beneficiaries have on the officials and the level of helpfulness of the staff can also be examined as an indicator of staff's performance.

d. Publicity measures: The public awareness about the scheme has been examined in many of the studies. The different publicity measures undertaken by the department to create public awareness can also be highlighted.

8. Comments of the Department: The evaluation process brings to light many aspects of the implementation of the scheme/programme. Both positive things and shortcomings are brought to light through the field investigation. Some of the findings are stated below to explain the point,

- "An analysis of the facts and figures presented lead to the conclusion that the present level of business can hardly justify their existence or expense as a commercial establishment" (Government Sales Emporium in Nagaland; SI, No 6).
- "No records of land acquisition have been maintained at the office of ADC, Dimapur." (Referral Hospital, Dimapur; SI. No. 30).
- "100% posts for the project have been created and appointments given by 1995...the Project will be commissioned at the very earliest in 7PS7"(Likimro Hydro Electric Project; SI No 31)
- "The quantity of rice issued/supplied ...as recorded by the Civil supply Directorate is shown as 1,22,288.13quintals where as the actual receipt of rice recorded by CPO centres are only 82,878.20 quintals.... in two years a/one"(Fair Price Shops in Zunheboto, SI No. 32)

The comments and responses of the department concerned should be taken after every evaluation for the presentation of the complete picture about the evaluation, i.e., does the department agree with and accept the findings and analysis of the evaluation. Does it have any reservations about the methodology or the conclusions drawn. If it accepts the shortcomings highlighted, what is the department intending to do to rectify the situation. Further, the department should be asked to explain *why* financial irregularities, delays in implementation, absence of systematic records, etc. are there (if any) and *fix* responsibility on the officials concerned. Without their comments and action the evaluation effort and expenditure will serve no purpose. **Except for five studies⁵, the responses of the concerned department have not been sought in any report.** Even in the case of studies undertaken at the instance of District Planning and Development Boards, the comments have not been sought from DPDB or the department concerned, or atleast, have not been mentioned in the study.

The comments of the Department concerned also plays an important role in immediately highlighting the lacunae in the methodology of the evaluation. The comments by the Rural Development department in the 17th publication question the instruments of analysis and bring to light the arbitrariness of the study.

^s Publication Number 2,3, 6,7 and 17.

9. Some lack of co-ordination was observed between the analysis by District Evaluation offices and the Evaluation Directorate. For example, the ED, DEO Zunheboto, DEO Phek and DEO Tuensang undertook evaluation study on IRDP, but, without any reference in their report about the other similar studies undertaken, or utilising the same methodology. Similar case was observed for evaluation study of ICDS (undertaken by the ED and DEO, Phek) and study of PHCs (by ED and DEO, Phek). While undertaking the evaluation study, the DEO should have examined the earlier done studies, adopted the same methodology as far as practicable to maintain uniformity, done a follow-up on the earlier study (if part of the earlier sampled states), or extended the analysis by drawing out the parallels and differences with the findings for the other districts (if the district was not part of the earlier sample). Similarly, study on the VDB programme has been done for Phek, Wokha, Kohima (& Dimapur) and Mokokchung districts. It was observed that the different DEOs used the same methodology, type of sample and reached similar observations and suggestions. All the studies could have been consolidated into a single study with a thorough state level analysis, financial appraisal, the problems & constraints, inter district comparisons, the success stories and failures found in different districts. By examining the different districts, some factors responsible for the success or failure of the Programme could have been highlighted in the consolidated report. A comprehensive State report on the VDB Programme could have been thus prepared.

3.2 Aspects relating to the report writing

Many of the reports are very well written, with detailed analysis and good tables. This has been remarked in Table II, column 9. Some of the striking aspects include:

1. Introduction has been very well written in many reports. The second report had a detailed and systematic introduction, ideal in many respects- general introduction about why and when the scheme was introduced in the country; when introduced in the state, its spread; the finer modalities about the scheme; department implementing the scheme and other organisational aspects of the implementation. Similarly, the well-written introduction of the Report on ICDS in Nagaland includes description of National, State level organisation, objectives of the programme and the evaluation methodology in detail. Other reports with remarkable introductions include Evaluation Report on IRDP in Phek and VDB programme in Wokha.

On the other hand, in many reports the description of the scheme (and related schemes) under evaluation - its origin, characteristics of the programme, activities and administrative arrangements have not been mentioned at all. Some mention and details should be there, relating to the description of the schemes under the programme. For example, the VDB programme has been evaluated in five districts in a very comprehensive manner. The Nagaland government is implementing certain schemes to strengthen the VDBs, such as Grant-in-Aid (GIA), Matching Cash Grant (MCG) and National Saving Scheme (NSS). These have not been mentioned at all in any of the five reports. Numerous other similar cases were observed while going through the reports.

2.The impact assessment has been well written. But, leaving aside the first ten reports (where the final chapter was drawn/based upon the chapter on impact assessment and the analysis therein), in many reports it was observed that the impact assessment and analysis was not correlated/ being referred to at all in 'Findings and Conclusions', the final chapter of the reports.

3.The schedules have not been attached along with in any report except the first report. Further queries from the Evaluation Directorate revealed that the schedules of the evaluation studies are not properly maintained in the office either.

Though schedules have been used in most of the studies, nothing is mentioned in any report regarding what exactly were the contents of the schedules. In many reports it is merely stated that a schedule was used for collection of primary data, with no mention about for whom was the schedule meant and what were the responses to the schedules. The absence of description of the schedules, along with their non-maintenance in the office lends an ambiguity to the methodology and analysis. It is also a great loss for future reference and utilisation.

4.A brief separate analysis of the responses to the schedules should constitute a clearly distinct section before the chapter on findings of the study. It should include sections such as contents and responses to the schedules, and if possible, views of the officials on the responses of the beneficiaries. Details on this aspect are in Section VII of this paper. If multiple schedules are used, the views/responses in different schedule should be presented separately.

5.In many studies the findings have not been stated in /do not emerge from the chapter on observation and analysis by the evaluation team. Certain crucial findings have merely been mentioned in the concluding chapter without any analysis, proof or source of the finding. This can be explained better with examples from some of the reports. In the report on IRDP (SL no. 10), the findings were adhoc and unsubstantiated.

"5.2(a) The assistance given to the beneficiary household was negligible in almost all cases, (b) Many schemes were not implemented in the field at all. It appears that to obtain a completion report for the drawal of money is not a problem even if the works are actually not done."

These findings constitute the main assessment of the implementation of the IRDP. They should have been part of the observations and substantiated with actual examples from the villages/beneficiaries.

Another glaring example is Publication No 23, where many findings which should have been central to the evaluation are merely stated in the Conclusion, without being discussed at all in the main body of the report. "19.11% beneficiaries received subsidy amount less than the official record.... sickly livestock supplied..... duplication of existing schemes. the VDBs are in the practice of delivering the amount to a number of persons in the village."

Conversely, in a few studies, the findings and suggestions are carefully considered and well connected with the body of the evaluation analysis, along with paragraphs mentioned as reference points. One such report is the Evaluation Report on VDB Programme in Phek.

6. In no report has an Executive Summary been presented as a part of the report. In many reports, the Summary and Conclusions, the final chapter has been presented as the first chapter in lieu of the executive summary. Other than the fact that Findings and Conclusion is no substitute for the executive summary, this gives the report a very incomplete finish and considerably lessens its impact on the reader. It is suggested that a brief Executive Summary, consisting of the following sections be presented as the first chapter.

- What was evaluated.
- Why was the evaluation conducted.
- What are the major findings & recommendations of the evaluation.

As also mentioned in Table II, the 22nd publication, Evaluation Report on ICDS in Nagaland, was found to be excellent in terms of report writing, analysis and methodology. Four stratified schedules have been constructed. Introduction is very well written. Systematic analysis has been done - at National level, State level & description and analysis of sampled centres. Direct and indirect indicators have been used as parameters for analysis. Examples of various centres are given to explain the findings. Tables give centre-wise details of the indicators. All functions have been analysed along with percentage based analysis. Beneficiary level analysis is also done well. The findings are drawn from the statistics and later summarised in the final chapter. A complete report in all respects except for absence of attached schedules and comments of the department concerned.

3.3 Spread of Evaluation Studies

1. Sectoral Coverage

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF SECTORS COVERED UNDER EVALUATION STUDIES.

Sl.No.	Theme	No. Of Reports/studies	% Of total Reports
1	Agriculture and Allied	10	23.8
2	Irrigation	-	-
3	Water supply	1	2.4
4	Rural Development	10	23.8
5	Industry	5	11.9
6	Energy	2	4.8
7	Transport	-	-
8	Employment and Training	1	2.4
9	Education	2	4.8
10	Health S Family Welfare	5	11.9
11	Social Welfare	2	4.8
12	Others	4	9.5
	Total	42	100.0

Table III shows that the Evaluation Directorate has undertaken ten studies each on Agriculture & Animal Husbandry and Rural Development related schemes, five each on Health and Industry related schemes. As these are important sectors of government resource allocation, the focus is appropriate. More studies on Social Welfare and Employment & Training can be undertaken as numerous government schemes have been formulated and implemented in these sectors with considerable government expenditure and inadequate impact. Evaluation Directorate can be assigned studies relating to irrigation, water supply or energy related schemes which have been under construction since a long time and yet not nearing completion. The key Rural Development schemes can also be evaluated again to reassess their impact under changed circumstances. \

2. District/ Evaluating Office based distribution

A glance at Table IV shows that in 1986 the DEOs first took the initiative of evaluating a programme. Since 1989, this has become a regular feature, with the DEOs conducting 16 of the 26 studies undertaken. Ten of the sixteen studies undertaken by the DEOs have been by DEO Phek and Zunheboto at the instance of their respective District Planning and Development Boards, The other DPDBs should also be encouraged to suggest schemes to the DEOs and utilise the reports in the planning process for better implementation of the scheme at the grass root level.

TABLE IV

EVALUATION OFFICE BASED REPRESENTATION OF THE EVALUATION STUDIES.

Year	Evaluation Directorate		Phek	Zunheboto	Wokha	Mokokchung	Tuesang	Mon	Kohi ma
	Evaluation Studies undertaken	Distts in Sample							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1969	Block Dev. Prog. (2)	Kma.							
1970	Khandsari Sugar Project (1)	All 3 distts.							
1975	1.erapani seed farm (3)	Mkg.							
	2.Fruit preservation & Canning Factor (4)	Mkg.							
1976	Key Village scheme(5)	Kma, Mkg, Tsg.							
1979	Govt. Sales Emporium (6)	Kma, Mkg, Tsg							
1980	1. PHCs (7)	Kma, Mkg, Zbto.							
1981	-								
1982	-								
1983	1.Industrial Estate (8)	Kma.							
	2.Govt. Workshop Oran. (10)								
1984	-								
1985	-								
1986	1.Elementary Education (9)	Kma, Zbto, Mon.					IRDP (23)		
	2.IRDP (11)	All? Distts.							
	3.Rural Water Supply (12)	Kma.							
1987	VDB (13)	Phek.							
1988	-								
1989	Piggery breeding (16)	Mkg, Tsg, Zbto.	IRDP(16)	IRDP (17)					
1990	-					TRYSEM (19)			
1991	ICDS (22)	Kma, Phek.			VDB (20)				VDB (21)
1992	-		1.Coffee plantation (24) 2.PHCs (25)						
1993	1. Doyang HE project (26)	Wokha.				VDB (28)			
	2. Mini Cement farm (27)	Phek.							
1994	-								
1995	1.Referral Hospital (30)	Kma.	Schools (29)						
	2.Likimro HE project (31)	Tsg.							
1996			Nutrition Pro. (33)	Fair price Shops(32) 1.Soil & water consv.(35) 2.Sericulture (37)				Rural Savan as (34)	
1997	Immunisation of Children (36)	All 7 Distts.							
1998	I.G. Stadium Complex	Kma.	Horti.						

	(38)		Research Farm (38)						
1999	1. Family Health awareness Week (40)	Kma.			Horticulture Dev (42)				
	2. Regional Rabbit Breeding farm (41)	Dmr.							
	Total	23	6	4	2	2	1	1	1

NOTE:

- i. District mentioned along with as it is assumed that the DEOs Helped / contributed in field surveys in their districts.
- ii. Figures in parenthesis indicate the publication number
- iii. Publication No 13 & 15 not available, Hence not included in analysis

In the last one decade (1990-91), the Evaluation Directorate has undertaken nine evaluations, with only one study (Immunisation of Children) being conducted in all the districts. On an average, one study has been produced per year. A division of work by utilising all the DEOs in the evaluation effort of each report (except when the DEO is involved in a district study) would have the following advantages:

- a. A wider, more comprehensive sample for state-level analyses.
- b. Quicker submission of studies through division of field investigation into seven DEOs and not just the Headquarter staff (so the evaluation of seven districts done simultaneously).
- c. More information would be available about some of the lesser-developed districts such as Mon and Tuensang.
- d. Better utilisation of DEO staff. A glance at column 3-10 of Table IV shows that many of the districts and DEOs are not involved in Evaluation Studies every year.
- e. Improvement in the evaluation capabilities of DEOs through continuous interaction with the ED officers during the studies. In fact, after involving all the DEOs in the State level evaluations, the DEO officers can later on be made the in-charge of some State level studies as well, i.e., the DEO officer made in charge studies the scheme, develops objectives, indicators and schedules; field investigation is undertaken by all the DEOs, observation and schedules are sent to the DEO officer in-charge to consolidate the findings and draft the report for submission to Evaluation Directorate for finalisation. In this manner, the Directorate will be able to produce four to five studies per year.

Section IV

The follow up

As per the first evaluation report on the Khandsari Sugar Project and Sugarcane Development Programme in Nagaland, *"The progress of the sugarcane development programme as analysed above created doubts about the success of the mill. It is not understood as to how and on what basis project authorities are going ahead with the erection of Mill machinery and other programmes without ensuring the availability of*

sufficient raw materials to feed the mill (4.10)"The mill has subsequently been shut down for reasons brought up by the report. This instance clearly indicates the important role evaluation can play in planning and allocation of limited resources of the state. Many reports have made concrete and practicable suggestions which indicated the ways of improving the implementation and/or avoiding future failures.

The very purpose of evaluation is defeated if there is no effective follow up of the recommendations of the evaluation reports. The evaluation studies do not appear to have had any impact on the planning process in the state or effected any modifications in the implementation of the programmes. This is because there appears to be a total absence of response on the studies by the departments, with no attempt to examine the findings, fix responsibility for mismanagement or implementation of the suggestions. The evaluation studies remain, at best, very well attempted academic exercises or research efforts.

Queries to the Evaluation Directorate revealed that it does not maintain any correspondence with the concerned departments regarding follow up action taken on the evaluation reports.

The role and importance of evaluation depends *only* upon its consequences - i.e., what action is taken by the authorities on the evaluation findings. The follow up of the evaluation studies has to be given much more attention than at present. Evaluation findings have little or no use unless they are acted upon. It is therefore suggested that the Evaluation Directorate continue to stress upon some responsive measures. Ensuring follow up requires the involvement of all the three concerned parties- the concerned department, Evaluation Directorate and the Steering Committee. The first requirement is that the recommendations should be practical and capable of being implemented. Secondly, the Evaluation Directorate should maintain liaison with the departments to monitor the progress of the follow up action. The Steering Committee should insist that action be taken on the recommendations. The recommendations can be discussed in the Steering Committee meetings and a time framework determined in consultation with the Secretary of the concerned department, within which the follow up action should be taken. The follow up can accordingly be reviewed in the subsequent meetings.

Section V

The Steering Committee

The Evaluation Steering Committee guides and oversees the activities of the Evaluation Directorate. The Evaluation Steering Committee was reconstituted on September 6¹" 2000. Its present composition and functions have been detailed in Section II of this paper. Earlier the Committee consisted of the Development Commissioner as the Chairman, and the Financial Commissioner, Secretary and Head of Department concerned, and Joint Director (Evaluation) as members.

The Evaluation Committee is expected to meet once in a quarter. However, no meeting of the Steering Committee has been held for many years now.

A greater involvement of the Steering Committee is required in terms of selection of programmes for evaluation, support during the evaluation process, insistence on

comments by the Department concerned and review of the action taken on the findings and suggestions in the reports. The active interest of the Steering Committee is a pre-requisite for effective functioning of the Evaluation Directorate. This has been inadequate. With the reconstitution of the Steering Committee, it is expected that the role of evaluation in the planning process will be considerably enhanced.

Section VI

The SWOT Analysis

An analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to/of the working of Evaluation Directorate is presented as a bird's eye view on its performance and future direction.

STRENGTHS:

1. The Evaluation Directorate has brought out some very good studies. The indicators thought out and used for impact assessment are worthy of appreciation. In spite of inadequate direction from the Steering Committee, it has been undertaking at least one evaluation study per year. The motivation and work deserve appreciation.
2. The evaluation capabilities of the District Evaluation Offices, especially DEO Phek is very encouraging. It indicates that with some guidance from the ED, the DEOs can undertake evaluation in a methodical manner and produce very good reports.

WEAKNESSES:

1. Inadequate representation of the financial, monitoring, administrative & staff related aspects which results in a partial analysis.
2. Absence of State and district level analysis in the reports. The analysis is limited only to the villages in the sample, again resulting in partial analysis. 3. The absence of comments of the department whose scheme is under evaluation is a serious lacuna that presents an incomplete picture of the actual field implementation and circumstances. The comments represent the other side of the picture - does the deptt. agree with the analysis, does it accept its shortcomings, as highlighted by the report, what corrective steps does it intend to take, what are the implementation problems it is facing at the field level.

OPPORTUNITIES:

1. The interest shown by the District Planning and Development Boards in examining the performance of certain schemes, and utilising the services of the District Evaluation Offices for the purpose, holds a lot of scope for efficient evaluation and its utilisation in the improvement in the schemes or their implementation.

2. The reconstitution of the Steering Committee indicates an increased interest in the Evaluation Directorate, which will have a positive impact on the number and quality of studies as well as the action taken on their recommendations.

THREATS:

1. Acceptance of the lack of records, as claimed by the department under evaluation, as the actual position results in an analysis which lacks depth.
2. Absence of action taken on the report's findings and suggestions, making the entire evaluation effort and expenditure merely an academic exercise.
3. Inadequate involvement of the Steering Committee in the selection of schemes for evaluation and analysis of the findings can adversely effect the motivation of the evaluating staff and the quality of the evaluation report. It also results In the evaluation process not being taken seriously by the officials of the department under evaluation, lack of cooperation and other avoidable constraints and bottlenecks to the evaluation.

The very good studies/reports include:

- a. Current Evaluation Report on Khandsari Sugar Project and Sugarcane Development Programme in the State
- b. Evaluation Report on the impact of Block Development Programme in Nagaland.
- c. Evaluation Report on Primary Health Centres in Nagaland.
- d. Report on the Village Development Boards Programme in Phek district.
- e. Evaluation Report on IRDP in Phek district
- f. Evaluation Report on ICDS in Nagaland.
- g. Evaluation Report on Coffee Plantation in Phek district.
- h. Evaluation Report on Immunisation of Children Programme in Nagaland.
- i. Impact Evaluation Report of Family Health Awareness Week Programme in Nagaland.

Section VII

Suggestions and Conclusion

Efficient evaluation plays an important role in a system of planned economy. It is necessary in order to know whether and how far the programmes and schemes, which constitute the Plan, are achieving the intended targets and the stated objectives. In the words of **Late Prof. Raj Krishna** ⁶, " **Evaluation is meant to improve the basic policy, project formulation and structural aspects of project administration. It is a detailed assessment of all aspects of the working of schemes such as the total amount of money spent, costs incurred per unit, benefits, employment generated, flow of expenditure and assessment of distributional objectives, etc.**". In the light of these characteristics and responsibilities of the evaluation procedure, some modifications and

additions need to be made to the present methodology of the Nagaland State Evaluation Directorate, which are suggested below.

1. The sampling technique

As mentioned in section 3.1, the analysis of the State and the districts under study is very important. Comprehensive analysis of the sampled villages should supplement State and district level analysis. The analysis of the performance of the programme for

⁶ *During the first conference of Heads of State Evaluation Organisations*

the State as a whole and sampled districts should be the third chapter in the report, after Executive summary and Introduction, followed by the chapter on village level analysis.

Secondly, as far as possible random sample technique should be used for selection of sampled villages. The beneficiary households should always be selected randomly. More districts can be included in the sample by involving all the DEOs in the field investigations. The evaluation reports have mentioned two constraints in having larger sample size for analysis- lack of manpower and lack of conveyance.

Lack of conveyance should not be allowed to remain a constraint in the determination of the sample size. The authorities should ensure the provision and utilisation of the vehicle(s) at the department's district office for touring of sampled villages.

Similarly, inadequate manpower should not be a determining factor for sample size. The staff from the Evaluation Directorate and adjoining DEOs should be made available for undertaking field investigations.

2. Data Collection. The following measures constitute the tools for evaluation.

- a. Interview: Series of oral questions answered by the respondent.
- b. Schedules/questionnaires: series of written questions answered by a respondent.
- c. Observation: organised appraisal and behavior of others.
- d. Government documents: Original and official papers that constitute the written records of administration.
- e. Informal feedback: unofficial transmission of evaluative comments from within the department.

All these tools should be utilised for collection of data. Interview technique, observations and schedules have been used by the Evaluation Directorate. However, some modifications are suggested below:

Stratified schedules should be constructed for objectivity and accuracy of data. Similar information should be collected from different levels/sources i.e. the Directorate, the district office, and the block office to check its reliability. The data thus collected, especially the financial information and beneficiary related quantitative information, can also be cross-checked for accuracy with the information available/sent to the Planning & Co-ordination Department for fund allocation/release. The beneficiaries should be interviewed, as people are the actual basis of development. Their responses should be recorded on a standardised schedule for uniformity and accurate impact assessment.

3. Collection of Secondary data: In most of the studies it has been stated that the secondary information has been collected from records and personal interviews. It is suggested that the interviews may be carried out in two phases-

Phase I

a. Interviews to collect the background material on the scheme- its objectives, target group, spread, mode of implementation, physical and financial aspects.

b. Interviews with state level officials to find out the main problems, successes, failures and the way the scheme is implemented in the state, sampled district and the selected blocks. The state level data along with district level bifurcation should be collected from the headquarters itself. The district data's bifurcation into blocks and selected villages should be attempted.

c. Interview with the District level officials and one officer from the district administration who is knowledgeable about the scheme (DC/ADC/SDO(C)). District level data should be collected from the district officials and cross checked with that collected from the state level sources. The comments regarding the scheme, problems in implementation, problems of the staff, monitoring and training aspects, success story/failures and suggestions.

The District officials should be interviewed for their comments regarding the viability of the programme in the district, practical difficulties, if any in implementation, the analysis of the work being done by the district officers of the programme, success and failures in the district if any, and their suggestions.

d. Interview of the Block level officials to know more about the sampled villages. And, if possible collect consolidated data regarding all the villages of the block. Some questions should be asked along similar lines as district officials. Attempt should be made to gauge the motivation and enterprise of the staff, their dedication, drive towards the programme, training and educational status and method of implementation.

e. Village level: The field team should meet the officials; interview the beneficiaries and one or two knowledgeable persons of the village (Village Council Chairman/ Secretary, village elders, etc)

Phase II

Subsequently, follow the hierarchy upwards. Re-question the district level officials regarding:

- i. Lack of proper records (this way, one can pin-point where the records get distorted /disappear.)
- ii. Financial irregularities found at the field level, their reasons and the persons responsible.
- iii. Other findings of the primary analysis and field investigations.

Again question the state level officials to confirm what his subordinates have told. The main lacunae found during the study should be discussed and the comments of the Directorate officials should be recorded and incorporated in the report as the official Version, before the final chapter on suggestions and conclusions.

Thus, what is being suggested is that the officials at different levels be interviewed twice. First for information on the scheme and the data, and the second time for their comments on the findings, especially the shortcomings brought to light during the field analysis. Such an analysis would be unbiased by indicating both points of views (beneficiaries & official), along with the concluding remarks on the aspect by the evaluating agency.

3. The following aspects should be examined and clearly stated,

- The origin of the scheme, i.e., Central govt, scheme or State Govt, scheme and the pattern of financing. The organisational structure from the Govt, of India to the beneficiary level should be briefly stated- which ministry of Govt, of India deals with the scheme, which deptt. of Nagaland Govt., the district office, Block level officer and office, the village official and the intended beneficiaries and other persons who are involved in the implementation of the programme.
- The goals of the scheme should be highlighted- creation of assets, employment generation, the availability of credit or commodities at reasonable prices, etc. The same should also constitute a part of the objectives of the evaluation study and be examined in terms of *quantitative indicators*. The qualitative appraisal should be subsequent.
- The time frame of analysis should be atleast five years for an accurate temporal analysis. It is also suggested that the reference of time should be there in the study (it is absent in many studies). It should be clearly stated when the field tours were undertaken and when the actual field observations were noted. Vagueness about exactly when the

study was conducted reduces its future utilisation and hinders analysis if a follow up of the study is subsequently done.

- As far as possible, a State level study should include all the districts (by involving all the DEOs). In case of District level analysis, if possible all the blocks should be included
- The administrative problems faced by the field staff and the directorate staff should also be highlighted through the evaluation study.
- The monitoring and supervision aspects have not been examined in the studies. These should be highlighted for a proper analysis of the programme's implementation.
- Any implementational problems should be portrayed through the studies. The study should focus on any changes required in the guidelines of the scheme for better implementation, or for better suiting the requirements of Nagaland or any specific district. Such suggestions would be of immense help to the concerned department to take up with higher authorities if so required.

4. The financial analysis as attempted in the reports is inadequate. The financial aspect is one of the most important aspects of the evaluation. How were the government resources utilised and to what effect, is the physical infrastructure created adequate when compared to the expenditure incurred; is the impact per beneficiary adequate when compared with the expenditure; is the number of beneficiaries sufficient in terms of the govt, outlay; is the govt, outlay sufficient or insufficient; productively utilised or unproductively - these are some of the basic questions which result in a felt need for the evaluation of a scheme/programme. Thus, these constitute the basic underlying questions which must be tackled in the report. Other aspects of financial analysis have already been detailed in section 3.1 of this report.

5. The analysis in the report should be at all levels- State, district, block and village. **A mere analysis of the sampled villages is an inadequate reflection on the performance of the district or state as a whole.** The presentation and analysis should be as under.

- Collection of the already existing Government records- this can be used both as background material for formulating the schedules as well as for preparing the state and districts profile regarding the scheme. In case of state level analysis of the scheme, this profile should include all the districts where the scheme is under implementation and not just the sampled districts.
- Detailed analysis of the state and sampled districts - based on the analysis of the State level and district level questionnaires. This, along with the govt, records, constitutes the secondary data, which is verified by collection of primary data at the field level.

- Analysis of the field level data- observations, interviews, official records, schedules, etc.
- Report on the views/ responses of the beneficiaries (as a separate distinguishable section), including a description of the content of the beneficiary schedule and the responses.
- If possible, meeting and taking the views of some knowledgeable persons regarding the implementation of the scheme, and problems therein at the district/ village level.
- Implications for the intended objectives and performance indicators
- Unintended outcomes
- Consolidated findings and observations based on all sources of information and observation.
- Overall conclusions and recommendations, including recommendations for the programme and concerning subsequent evaluations,

6. The formulated schedules should be attached along with in the report as an annexure to make the study more clear. A glance at the questionnaires would indicate how comprehensive an analysis has been carried out at the field level. It would also enable future evaluators to examine the methodology for reference and later use.

7. As mentioned before, the physical achievements and impact assessment has been done well in many reports. It is however suggested that the impact should be linked with the amount of money spent by the government to achieve that level of impact to determine the level of success of the programme. In terms of govt, expenditure, is the impact adequate or inadequate; or conversely, what percentage of government expenditure has been productive in terms of really fulfilling the underlying objectives of the programme.

8. The involvement of the District Planning and Development Boards in the recommendation of schemes to the District Evaluation Boards is a positive step. It enables more evaluation at the district level, effects improvements in the decentralised planning (by providing feedback to the district planning efforts) and better utilisation of the existing staff. Until now only DPDB Phek and Zunheboto have been taking an interest in the evaluation efforts. The other DPDBs need to be involved as well. Therefore, the Chairman of the DPDB, i.e. the Deputy Commissioner should be informed about the activities of the District Evaluation Offices, and requested to suggest schemes for evaluation. The responsibility of maintaining the liaison should be of the District Evaluation Officer. As he is a member of the monthly District Planning Board meetings, he can have regular discussions with other so that not only schemes are decided for evaluation in the district, but also to encourage action on the findings and suggestions in the reports.

9. The comments of the concerned departments should be sought on the report. Before the publication, the report should be sent to the concerned department through the Planning and Co-ordination department for a written response in terms of

- a. Comments on findings and suggestions, and
- b. Action proposed to be taken on the suggestions.

The response should also be published so that the departments point of view so that the practicable difficulties in the implementation of the programme which didn't emerge from the study would emerge from the departments responses. It will also indicate the departments acceptance or non-acceptance of the views, methodology and findings of the evaluation team.

Trough the comments the department's commitment to modifications (if any) will be duly recorded for future use (periodically the action taken can be reviewed in the Steering Committee meetings). It is also suggested that once the responses on the reports are regularly received from various departments, the Evaluation Directorate can start undertaking quick reviews on the earlier studies, especially the major schemes, to examine whether the findings, impact and suggestions determined earlier still hold true, whether any action has been taken by the department and what further steps are now required for improved implementation of the programme.

10. If the Evaluation Reports are to be taken seriously, it is suggested that a copy be sent to the Office of the Auditor General, especially the finance related findings. For example, in the case of Publication Number 24 (Coffee plantation in Phek), seventy four lack rupees were spent in a period of five years, while the total production was four and a half kilograms of coffee, which too got spoilt due to lack of knowledge/training of the farmers. Similarly, in the case of publication no. Eleven (Rural water supply in Jalukie B village), *"it was a surprise to see that in the official records, the scheme as estimated was completed and an amount of Rs 309115.38 was actually spent on the scheme.....it was found that only an extension line was provided from Kejanglwa village water supply..... 15 days with completely dry, 5 days with little water and eleven days with sufficient water (for 30-35 minutes only).....is the benefit derived by the Village"*

The Doyang Hydro Electric project is another study which justifies that the report along with a list of main findings should be sent to the AG office for proper financial verification and fixation of responsibility. The district administration, and the then Addl. Deputy Commissioner should be asked to explain the strong allegations against him regarding land acquisition and compensation.

Some punitive action should be taken against officials who utilised the limited funds available for the *construction* of the Dimapur Referral Hospital to purchase mattresses, pillows, furniture, furnishings and vehicles (as found in the evaluation study), when the construction of the building was likely to take another *decade for completion*.

Such a blatant wastage/misutilisation of government resources in a resource tight state requires fixation of responsibility and punishment to discourage the misuse of government funds. This can be facilitated by sending the evaluation reports, along with a summary of the findings to enable the AG Office to undertake a thorough financial probe for fixation of responsibility. Involvement of the AG, if required, would also send across the message that the government is serious about the performance of the depts.in implementing the programmes and about the evaluation process- which will have a positive impact on the quality of both the implementation and the evaluation.

11.The success /failure of a programme is a function of many factors. It is suggested that along with the random sampling method, the field officers (distt./block level) should be probed to find out if the scheme has been doing exceptionally well (success story) or not working out at all (failure) anywhere in their district. These cases can be highlighted along with the sampled villages/towns/districts. It would bring to light places and persons who have been working to make a scheme successful. Similarly, by highlighting areas of failure/ineffectiveness, the factors responsible can be isolated and determined. These can be tackled during the Secretary level discussions (Steering Committee meetings) to explore ways for improvement.

12. A proactive role of the Steering committee. The Steering Committee should try to meet once in every quarter or atleast twice in a year. It is not possible to evaluate all programmes and schemes due to limited resources. Therefore the programmes to be evaluated should be selected with great care and deliberation. A list of studies to be conducted within a financial year (three to four studies) should be made and finalised in the Steering Committee meeting at the beginning of the year. This would enable the Evaluation Directorate to undertake a thorough collection and examination of the background material and make preliminary arrangements to undertake the field tours. When the studies to be conducted are known in advance, the stratified schedules can be made in a comprehensive manner and can also be pre tested on a trial basis before the onset of the study.

The comments of the departments can be insisted upon if the Secretaries to the Government (part of the Steering Committee) meet regularly to review the studies conducted. There is urgent need for action by the concerned departments on the findings and suggestions in the reports. The earlier findings of the reports, the comments of the departments and the action taken should be reviewed during the Steering Committee meetings to maintain a pressure on the departments in respect of proper implementation of the schemes.

Regular meetings of the Steering Committee would also result in better involvement of the concerned department in conducting the study, through co-operation and access to the records. It is suggested that at the beginning of every study the Development Commissioner should send a sort of '**facility letter**' to the Secretary of the concerned department and the heads of the sample districts to extend co-operation and facilities required to the evaluation teams. This would take care of two of the limitations often faced by the evaluating officers— lack of co-operation and access to records by the department and less in-depth study (with a smaller sample) due to non-availability of vehicle. Non of the DEOs have a vehicle, except one old one at DEO Wokha. It is suggested that a vehicle be made available at the district level for block and village level field tours (most District offices have access to government vehicles). At least one district level official should accompany the field team, if they so require, to help locate the sampled beneficiaries. This will also serve an additional purpose of instant verification of the responses of the block level officials as well as ensure assistance of the block level officials.

13. Training: No training has been provided since a very long time (since 1993) to any of the officers and staff of the Evaluation Directorate and its district offices. Details of trainings received by the officers and staff are given in Annexure 'A. Besides the Evaluation Directorate, Nagaland has four other research organisations/institutions with capabilities in evaluation methodology. These are:

- a. State Council of Educational Research & Training, Govt of Nagaland, Kohima.
- b. State Institute of Rural Development, Government of Nagaland, Kohima.
- c. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Medziphema.
- d. Soil Conservation, Research, Training and Demonstration Centre, Sechu, Govt, of Nagaland.

The Evaluation Directorate and SIRD, Kohima have held some training schedules for the staff of the Directorate. It is suggested that training options should be explored with all these institutions for the Directorate and the District officials. The Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, New Delhi has been taking a lot of interest in the Evaluation Capabilities of the State Evaluation Organisations and providing funds and facilities for their training. Liaison should also be maintained with the PEO for training at New Delhi, or at other reputed research institutions of India.

Once the more scientific evaluation measures are adopted, then following steps' can also be considered:

⁷ *Abridged and modified from "Evaluation Capacity Development & Restructuring of PEO" by Dr S.P.Pal, Adviser (Evaluation), Planning Commission, New Delhi.*

- a. Each major scheme be compulsorily evaluated once in every five years.
- b. Putting the evaluation studies on the web site to make evaluation findings accessible to all potential users.
- c. Evaluation results be discussed during the annual plan discussions to determine the share of resources to be assigned to the scheme for the next plan year/ period.

14. The evaluation directorate has so far completed forty-two studies. There is need for a compendium of the evaluation studies conducted which will be very informative to the evaluation staff and the different departments whose schemes have been evaluated for future reference. It will also provide a glimpse of the actual field experience to the various institutions/students studying the various aspects of socio-economic development in Nagaland. The compendium can also be sent to Planning Commission, Govt, of India as an indication of the unbiased evaluation efforts of the Nagaland Govt, which is equal to the evaluation effort of the other, bigger states of India.

Numerous suggestions have been mentioned above. On the whole they represent an evaluation undertaken under ideal conditions, which are actually not there at the field level. The lack of records, lack of co-operation from the deptt. under evaluation, the different dialects, lack of connectivity and inaccessibility of many regions, inadequate transportation and last but not the least, the lack of follow up on the findings and suggestions of the evaluation constitute serious obstacles in the evaluation effort. Though some of the obstacles are insurmountable, and have to be tackled at the field level to the best ability, the role of the Development Commissioner in reducing the difficulties cannot be stressed enough. The periodic guidance and review through the Steering Committee meetings, sending of 'facility letter' to the department and district heads for extending co-operation and help to the evaluating teams, seeking comments on the field report and insisting on action taken on the findings of the evaluation report can improve and strengthen the evaluation efforts in the state, thereby enabling it to achieve the goal of helping planning keep its intended course. Name and Designation

ANNEXURE A

Name and Designation	Nature of Training	Venue	Period	Year
1. Sh. N. Zelianrj , Joint Director				
a.	Man Power forecasting	IAMR. New Delhi	10 days	1988
b. When Investigator	Methodology & Technique	Lucknow	1 month	1970s
2. Sh. P.B. Wati , Deputy Direct				
a. When Investigator	Methodology & Technique	Lucknow	1 month	1970s
3. Sh. Peter Ovung , Assistant Director				
a. When Investigator	Methodology & technique in Evaluation	Guwahati	26 days	1984
4. Sh. Yevikhe Sema , Assistant Director				
a. When Investigator	Methodology & technique in Evaluation	Guwahati	15 days	1984
b. When Investigator	Methodology & technique in Evaluation	Guwahati.	1 month	1982
5.15 officers & staff	Preparation of study design, data Collection, approach to report writing	Evaluation Directorate	4 days	1990
6. Seven officers				
	Data Management for monitoring & Evaluation of Rural Dev. Programme	SIRD, Kohima	4 days	1992
7. 2 Asstt. Directorate	Statistical Technique for Planning	SIRD, Kohima	5 days	1993
7 Evaluation Officers	& Evaluation of R.D. Programme			
22 Evaluation Inspectors				

ANNEXURE B
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND
PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION DEPARTMENT
PLANNING BRANCH

PLN-875/2000

Dated 16th September 2000.

ORDER

Sub: Review of the evaluation studies and methodology followed by the Evaluation Directorate, Government of Nagaland- Assignment of Duties thereof.

The undersigned is directed to refer on the above mentioned subject and to assign Smt. Aparna Bhatia, Officer on Special Duty (OSD), Planning and Co-ordination Department to examine the reports on the evaluation studies carried out by the Nagaland State Evaluation Directorate and review the approach and methodology followed therein. The follow up action (if any) taken by the concerned departments, whose schemes/ programmes have been evaluated will be examined to ascertain modifications required in the functioning of the Evaluation Steering/ Review Committee. The concerned Departments are requested to extend co-operation and assistance to her, as and when required.

Sd/-
ALEMTEMSHI JAMIR
Special Secretary to Chief Minister &
Development Commissioner

To

1. Joint Director, Evaluation Directorate. He is requested to provide all the reports and other related documents.
2. Smt Apama Bhatia, IES, OSD Planning, for information and necessary action.
3. The District Planning Officer, Dimapur for information.

Copy to:

1. The Principal Secretary to Chief Minister.
2. The Senior P.S. to Minister, Planning & Co-ordination.
3. The Senior P.S. to Chief Secretary.