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Helpdesk activities

- **Primary goal** of Helpdesk: to improve evaluations carried out on Cohesion policy programmes

- In addition to provision of training course each year on important aspects of evaluation:
  - provides **expert support** to individual MA on particular evaluation issues:
    - last year, advice to Latvia on proposed evaluation of effects of 2007-2013 programmes on regional development
    - this year in May, methodological support to Greek MAs on design and management of evaluations
  - undertakes **peer reviews** of selected evaluations by experts
    - as announced at last meeting, intention to broaden scope of peer reviews
Peer reviews

- **Aim**: to subject selected evaluations to critical appraisal by leading evaluation experts so as to highlight strengths and weaknesses and ways of improving

- **Purpose**: to encourage MAs to undertake good quality evaluations and to demonstrate how to do so

From evaluations reviewed - **shortcomings** evident, originating largely from deficiencies in evaluation process itself:

- ToRs poorly framed
- evaluation questions – too many, too imprecise, too ambitious
- methods specified not linked to evaluation questions
- inadequate supervision of evaluation process

- **Implication**: to improve evaluations, need to review whole evaluation process to identify reasons for shortcomings and how to correct them
Peer reviews – next steps

➢ To subject ‘evaluation dossiers’ rather than just final evaluation reports to critical review, covering:
  • ToRs
  • Selection of evaluators
  • Budget
  • Inception and interim reports as well as final
  • Other documents relating to process
  o Requires cooperation of MAs to have access to reports, documents and details of evaluation process

➢ To open up peer review meetings to MAs and to involve evaluators so that they can learn directly from experts’ comments and advice

➢ To follow an evaluation from its inception and peer review each element of the process before put into effect so as to advise on how to improve

➢ To use such evaluations as ‘showcases’ for mutual learning
Putting these steps into practice

- First extended peer review in Malta next week

**Subject of review:**

1) Dossier of completed evaluation on: ‘Contribution of 2007-2013 Initiatives to competitiveness and improvement of quality of life’

2) **ToR of planned evaluation:** ‘Provision of services for data collection and analysis and assessment of methodological approaches and tools to carry out a counterfactual impact evaluation and/or other impact evaluations’

- Both will be subjected to critical appraisal by 3 leading evaluation experts with MA present at meeting

- Peer review = **pilot** – approach will be adopted in future if proves successful and useful for MA

- Ready and willing to support other MAs in similar way
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