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1. Introduction

Noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) are the leading cause of death globally, killing more people each year than all other causes combined. Contrary to common perceptions, available data show that nearly 80% of NCD-related deaths occur in low- and middle-income countries. Moreover, recent decades have witnessed a steady increase in such deaths, with vulnerable population groups often worst affected, and yet many of the dire human and social consequences could be prevented by implementing cost-effective and feasible interventions.

The Political declaration of the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases (2011) (1) recognizes the scale of the NCD crisis and the urgent need for action. The Global action plan for the prevention and control of NCDs 2013–2020 (2), recently extended to 2030, provides a vision and a road map to scale up action for the prevention and control of NCDs.

The global epidemic of NCDs is widely acknowledged as a major challenge to development in the 21st century and is a significant threat to achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. In addition, globally, the main NCDs represent the greatest cause of death in people aged under 70 years, imposing years of disability on those affected and their families. The Global status report on noncommunicable diseases 2014 (3) highlights the need to intensify national multisectoral action to meet the global targets that governments have agreed upon and to protect people from cardiovascular diseases, cancers, diabetes and chronic respiratory diseases.

Countries, including some that are low income, are showing that it is feasible to make progress and reduce premature deaths from NCDs. But that progress, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, is insufficient and uneven. The global status report of 2014 reveals a distressing gap in our ability to achieve Sustainable Development Goal target 3.4 of reducing, by one third, premature deaths from NCDs by 2030, and outlines the disparities in progress on preventing NCDs worldwide.

This toolkit is a “how to” guide for developing, implementing and evaluating a multisectoral action plan for prevention and control of NCDs. It is targeted at policy-makers, planners and programme managers, and is intended to help countries, provinces and cities meet the requirements for achieving global and national NCD targets and the Sustainable Development Goals.

The toolkit takes the user through a series of actions related to the development of a multisectoral action plan (“MSAP development actions”), and provides forms and a template framework for users to complete as they undertake these actions.

Developing a multisectoral action plan involves establishing health needs and engaging relevant stakeholders before determining the actions to take, identifying and prioritizing interventions, deciding on ways to address
NCDs while establishing support and resources for prevention and control, and evaluating progress in implementing the plan.

Using the toolkit is an inclusive and participatory process that involves engaging relevant stakeholders before determining the actions to take. The toolkit focuses on the main NCDs and wider determinants of health and aims to reduce the premature mortality from NCDs and the negative impacts of these determinants on health and health inequalities.

This work entails an array of competencies, such as situation analysis, advocacy, planning, mobilizing, implementing interventions and evaluating them, and disseminating the results of the evaluation. Users can refer to programme theory and logic modelling to guide the development of their action plan. The structure of the toolkit is set out in Fig. 5.1.

Fig. 5.1 Structure of the toolkit for developing a multisectoral action plan for noncommunicable diseases

This module provides detailed guidance on how to evaluate implementation of a multisectoral action plan. Evaluation should be done on a regular basis to discern if the plan is reaching its goal and achieving its outcomes, and if it is doing so in an efficient manner. A well-designed evaluation can serve to motivate stakeholders and enhance national and local advocacy efforts. How this is to be achieved is an important final part of the toolkit.
2. Stakeholder involvement

Key stakeholders must be involved in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of NCD plans and programmes. Within a ministry of health there will be different types of stakeholders, such as programme managers and senior managers in departments of prevention, health promotion, and hospital and health services. Other stakeholders may come from ministries for transport, economics, agriculture, and education, funding partners, nongovernmental organizations, civil society and community members.

It is critical to ensure that there are clear and accurate descriptions of the policies, plans and programmes, so that all interventions, activities and desired outcomes are clearly understood by all involved in their evaluation. The reasons for a particular monitoring and evaluation activity should be clearly defined at the outset. It is also important to state who the intended users are of the information that will result, and when they will require the information. If the purpose is not clear, there is a risk that the evaluation activity will focus on the wrong issues, draw the wrong conclusions and provide recommendations that will not be useful to the intended users.

A simple stakeholder assessment such as that outlined in Module 2 can help the evaluation team identify key individuals or groups to engage in the evaluation of the multisectoral action plan. Stakeholders can make meaningful contributions during all phases of the evaluation, including evaluation planning, implementation, and the sharing and use of findings. Based on evaluation needs and stakeholders’ skills and interests, members of the evaluation stakeholder group can be engaged as:

— external reviewers of the evaluation plan and methods
— members of the evaluation advisory committee
— data sources (i.e. participants in evaluation interviews and surveys)
— data collectors
— data analysts
— interpreters of findings
— writers (e.g. of final evaluation reports, manuscripts, briefs) and presentation developers
— presenters or advocates who share findings with community partners and policy-makers.

It is not necessary for all stakeholders to participate in all phases of the evaluation. Some may contribute only to evaluation planning, while the participation of others may be limited to providing implementation support or sharing the evaluation findings.
3. Evaluation design and methods

This section will take you through the process of designing your evaluation framework and methodology. By the end of the section you will be in a position to complete the evaluation section of the MSAP template (which can be downloaded here).

3.1 Identifying the evaluation focus

The focus of any evaluation will be a reflection of whether the plan is at the planning stage, being implemented, or at the stage of maintaining its outcomes and achievements. An evaluation at the planning stage will have a very different focus from one of a plan that has been in existence for several years.

For an evaluation during the planning stage, the following questions need to be addressed:

— What are the strategic direction, vision, strategies and key components of the plan?
— What is the plan’s target population?
— How does the plan reach them?
— What is the coverage of the interventions?
— How much will it cost?

An evaluation that included outcomes would make little sense at the planning stage. Conversely, an evaluation of the plan during the maintenance stage would need to include some measurement of progress on outputs and outcomes.

Evaluation can focus on the implementation process and/or the effectiveness of its outcomes, but often both will be required. It will depend on the stage of implementation of the plan. This module provides guidance on both, examples of which are provided in Table 5.1.

Process evaluation and outcome evaluation

Process evaluations document the process of implementation. Process evaluations help stakeholders see how an outcome or impact was achieved. Process evaluations cover all aspects of the process to deliver a plan and are useful for:

— tracking the reach of the plan;
— tracking the level of implementation of all aspects of the plan; and
— identifying potential or emerging problems – whether the plan has been delivered as planned and whether modifications to the plan need to be made.

The focus of a process evaluation is the:
— types and quantities of services delivered;
beneficiaries of those services;
— resources used to deliver the services;
— practical problems encountered; and
— ways in which such problems were resolved.

Outcome evaluations assess the effectiveness of the plan in producing change. Outcome evaluations focus on difficult questions that address what happened to participants of the plan and how much of a difference the plan made to them. Outcome evaluations are undertaken when it is important to know whether and how well the objectives were met.

Table 5.1 Type of evaluation: process or outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process evaluation</th>
<th>Outcome evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goal is generally to inform changes or make improvements in the plan’s operations</td>
<td>Goal is to identify the results or effects of a plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents what the plan is doing and to what extent and how consistently the plan has been implemented as intended</td>
<td>Measures plan beneficiaries’ changes in knowledge, attitude(s), behaviour(s) and/or condition(s) that result from a plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require a comparison group</td>
<td>May include a comparison group (impact evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes qualitative and quantitative data collection</td>
<td>Typically requires quantitative data and advanced statistical methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Developing evaluation questions

A number of evaluation questions may arise over the life of a multisectoral action plan that might reasonably be asked at any point in time. Addressing the questions about plan effectiveness means putting resources into documenting and measuring the implementation of the plan and its success in achieving intended outcomes and, in turn, using such information to be accountable to all stakeholders.

Evaluation questions should reflect the purpose of the evaluation and the priorities and needs of the stakeholders. They should help focus the evaluation and provide information about the plan’s components/activities. Evaluation teams need to classify the questions as overall progress, process, or outcome evaluation questions.

Overall progress evaluation questions

Overall progress evaluation questions are concerned with how well the plan is being implemented in general, and therefore tend to be fairly broad, as can be seen in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2 Example questions for the review of implementation progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In what context is the multisectoral action plan operating?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the plan accomplishing its intended results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the key achievements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which factors have supported or challenged the implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which parts of the plan are working? Which parts are not working? Do resources need to be refocused?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has equity in health improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any international collaborative actions for NCD prevention and control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have plan participants (staff, community organisations, community members) been satisfied with the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the uptake of the plan varied by socio-economic position or rural/metropolitan location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective were the contracting and subcontracting arrangements that were established to support plan implementation and evaluation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process evaluation questions**

Process evaluation questions are primarily concerned with the actual delivery of the plan – its governance and implementation.

Process evaluation questions should incorporate key process components of the logic model (inputs, activities, and outputs). Tables 5.3 and 5.4 below provide examples of process evaluation questions.

Table 5.3 Example process evaluation questions related to governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements of process evaluation related to governance</th>
<th>Examples of evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall review of process</td>
<td>— Has the process of implementation happened as planned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— What factors (both positive and negative) have affected the implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— What were the kinds of problems and barriers encountered in delivering the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Were there enough resources from the beginning to do it well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination/partnership</td>
<td>— Has the country established a partnership for NCD prevention and control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>— Has money been disbursed as planned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4 Example questions related to other strategic areas of NCD prevention and control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements of process evaluation related to other strategic areas</th>
<th>Process and output questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Risk factor reduction | — Have the activities for NCD prevention and health promotion been implemented as planned?  
— What specific interventions were put into place by the plan in order to tackle NCDs and their risk factors?  
— Does the new intervention improve knowledge and behaviour among participants, as intended?  
— Did the interventions work or not – and how and why? |
| NCD management | — Have the activities for NCD management been implemented as planned?  
— What proportion of the target group has received the health service?  
— What policies for NCD management have been developed and implemented?  
— Has the information system for NCD management been improved?  
— Has access to essential medicines improved?  
— Has human resources for NCD management been improved? |
| NCD surveillance | — Have the activities for NCD surveillance been implemented as planned?  
— Has NCD surveillance been integrated into the national health information system? |
| NCD research | — Have the activities for NCD research been implemented as planned?  
— Is the national NCD research network established? |
Outcome questions

Outcome evaluation questions are concerned with the effects of the delivery and operations of the multisectoral action plan on the target population(s). They should address key outcome components from the logic model discussed in the Overview. Depending on whether they are short-, intermediate- or long-term outcomes, they can be reviewed annually, in the medium-term, or during the final review. Table 5.5 presents example questions for outcome evaluations of a plan.

Table 5.5 Example questions for outcome evaluation of NCD prevention plan and programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation focus</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Impacts and outcomes | — Have the plan impacts and outcomes been achieved?  
                        — What impact has the plan had on populations facing the greatest inequalities?  
                        — What unanticipated positive and negative impacts/outcomes have arisen from the programme?  
                        — Have all strategies been appropriate and effective in achieving the impacts and outcomes?  
                        — What have been the critical success factors and barriers to achieving the impacts and outcomes?  
                        — Is the cost reasonable in relation to the magnitude of the benefits?  
                        — Have levels of partnership and collaboration increased? |
| Implications for future plan/programmes and policy | — Should the plan be continued or developed further?  
                                                        — Where should it go from here?  
                                                        — How can the operation of the plan be improved in the future?  
                                                        — What performance monitoring and continuous quality improvement arrangements should be maintained into the future?  
                                                        — How will the programme, or the impacts of the programme, be sustained beyond the funding timeframe? Will additional resources be required to continue or further develop the programme? |

3.3 Identifying indicators

After working with stakeholders to identify focus areas for the evaluation and the framing of the evaluation questions, the evaluation team should identify indicators for each of the evaluation questions.

Indicators should be visible, measurable signs of performance. Note that an evaluation question may have more than one indicator. Most multisectoral action plans will not require an extensive list of indicators, and preference should be given to quality rather than quantity. Table 5.6 presents examples of questions and indicators for an evaluation question related to partnerships.
### Table 5.6 Example questions and indicators for evaluation of a multisectoral action plan intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Has a partnership for NCD prevention and control been established?               | — Meeting participation rates  
|                                                                                 | — Types and number of sectors represented  
|                                                                                 | — Representativeness of key target groups  
|                                                                                 | — Types and number of partner contributions  |
| Has the plan been implemented as intended?                                       | — Extent to which plan objectives are implemented as intended  
|                                                                                 | — Number of member organizations that implement an activity related to the plan  |
| Does the intervention improve knowledge and behaviour among participants, as intended? | — Individual participants’ knowledge and behaviour before the education session  
|                                                                                 | — Individual participants’ knowledge and behaviour after the education session  |

### MSAP DEVELOPMENT ACTION 15: Work with stakeholders to frame the evaluation

#### 3.4 Setting up the evaluation

**Establishing a budget**

You will need to establish a source of funding and a budget for the evaluation. This will have a major impact on who conducts the evaluation and the way in which it is managed.

**Establishing an evaluation team**

It will be necessary to establish a team to conduct and manage the evaluation, but before building the team it is important to consider what evaluation skills or approaches are needed to successfully conduct this evaluation.

You may prefer the evaluation to be managed from within your organisation, or decide that it would be advisable and feasible to bring in outside experts to conduct the evaluation and report its findings.

**Working out a timeline**

If the evaluation is being done within the organisation a timeline will need to be worked out that incorporates the following tasks:

— planning and administration  
— training of data collectors  
— data collection, analysis, and interpretation  
— information dissemination.

Once this has been mapped on to a timeline, check for any foreseeable bottlenecks or sequencing issues.
### 3.5 Identifying data sources and collection method

When gathering data for the evaluation, you will need to consider what methods are appropriate for the data, and for obtaining answers to the evaluation questions posed.

The following points will need to be considered:

- Will new data be collected to answer the evaluation questions and/or will secondary data be used? Can you use data from the performance measurement system?
- What methods will be used to collect or acquire the data?
- How will data collection instruments be identified or created?
- How will instruments for readability, reliability, validity, and cultural appropriateness be tested?
- How will the quality and utility of existing data be determined?

Table 5.7 provides examples of the main methods for data collection and potential data sources for use in evaluation.

#### Table 5.7 Sample of data collection methods and potential data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date collection method</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and grey literature</td>
<td>— Promotional literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and state vital statistics systems</td>
<td>— Vital registration system data reported via National Vital Statistics Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease registry</td>
<td>— Cancer registries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with key informants or focus groups</td>
<td>— Interviews with government officials and health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Interviews with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Interviews with residents and patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Notes from discussions with staff or other key personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>— Partnership meetings or on-the-job performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>— Partnership member rosters, meeting attendance records, memoranda of understanding, product distribution records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Publicity about the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Logs and diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Minutes of internal group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Other plans and materials from relevant sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Scientific and grey literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing of financial records and accounts</td>
<td>— Financial records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surveys and surveillance systems

- Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)
- Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS)
- Existing surveys and surveillance systems or those developed as part of the plan
- Pre-and post-test surveys designed for specific interventions

Table 5.8 provides example indicators, an example data source and an example data collection method for a partnership evaluation question.

Table 5.8: Example indicators, data source and data collection method for partnership evaluation question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of focus</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Has the country established a partnership for NCD prevention and control?</td>
<td>- Meeting participation rates&lt;br&gt;- Types and number of sectors represented&lt;br&gt;- Representativeness of key target groups&lt;br&gt;- Types and number of partner contributions</td>
<td>Programme record</td>
<td>Programme coordinator will abstract relevant data from database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSAP DEVELOPMENT ACTION 16:
Work with stakeholders to plan data collection
4. Analysing and interpreting data

After designing an evaluation and collecting the data, the information must be described, analysed, and interpreted, so a judgment can be made about the meaning of the findings in the context of the multisectoral action plan. There are many methods of evaluation and it is not possible for a practical guide to adequately explain them all. In this section we will look at just some of the basic techniques for managing and analysing data.

4.1 Data management

Data management is the process of ensuring the data collected is a valuable resource for the prevention and control of NCDs. Capacity to conduct the following activities is essential:

- data storage
- data quality assurance
- data processing and compilation.

4.2 Analysing data

Once data are collected, they need to be systematically and carefully analysed. In some cases, data can be tabulated manually, in others computer programmes can help with the processing and summarizing of both quantitative and qualitative data.

The importance of valuing and seeking multiple perspectives comes into play during this phase of the evaluation. Quantitative data analysis requires interpretation of the results and seeing if they make sense, given the project's contextual factors – something the staff involved will know better than most.

Project staff and the evaluation team should work together and ask:

- Do these results make sense?
- What are some possible explanations for findings that are surprising?
- What decisions were made about categories and indicators of success? Have we missed other indicators?
- How might what we choose to collect and analyse be distorting the programme/initiative?
- And, most importantly, how will the numbers and results help us decide what actions will improve the programme?

Qualitative data includes information gathered from interviews, observations, written documents, journals, or even open-ended survey questions. Information gathered from interviews and observations is often recorded in lengthy narratives or field notes. In some cases, interviews are tape-recorded and then transcribed.

Some of these accounts are useful and can stand alone – providing important information about how the plan is working. In most cases, however, it is valuable to analyse your qualitative data in more systematic ways.
4.3 Arriving at an evaluation

The quantitative and qualitative data gathered can be used to answer the evaluation questions posed by the stakeholders in Action 15, and to make an assessment of the success with which each aspect of the plan being evaluated has been implemented.

Achievements in reducing major risk factors, strengthening surveillance, building capacity, or establishing research networks should all be noted. Where the implementation process has not gone smoothly, or the outcomes have been lower than expected, it is important to work out what factors have contributed to this.

Recommendations may need to be made about future action, such as capacity building, the raising of additional funding, and further engagement with stakeholders.

MSAP DEVELOPMENT ACTION 17:
Liaise with project staff over analysis of results

4.4 Drafting a report

Whatever the strategy you develop for disseminating the findings of your evaluation, it will be helpful to draft and finalize a full-findings report with evaluation stakeholders, from which information can be extracted to develop more concise results documents tailored to specific audiences.

In general, a detailed evaluation report should include:

— executive summary
— evaluation background and purpose
— acknowledgement of who commissioned and conducted the evaluation
— description of how the evaluation was conducted, what methods were employed, and in what timeframe
— evaluation results and limitations
— summary of the findings and recommendations
— annexes containing relevant information about working procedures and more detailed information about the data (such as tables).

A more detailed outline can be found in Annex B.

MSAP DEVELOPMENT ACTION 18:
Prepare an evaluation report
5. Communicating findings and utilizing results

This section offers guidance about the presentation and communication of evaluation results. Disseminating evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders and other interested parties can fulfil many objectives. These may include demonstrating the plan’s relevance, improving working practices, accounting to funding and regulatory bodies, informing local communities and gaining support for current and future plans. This section will help the evaluation team do the following:

— identify the key components of an evaluation report;
— determine with whom to share the evaluation results and when and how to share these findings;
— describe the steps that programme managers will take to ensure that evaluation findings will be used to inform plan improvement efforts; and
— apply these skills by using the guides provided in this section.

You will need to consider who the main audiences are for the report on your findings – which will depend on whether the report is on the progress of the implementation or on the outcomes of the plan – and the purpose of the communication. This will lead you to consider the most appropriate method of communication and the most suitable “messenger”.

The timing of the communication might also need to be considered. There may be a pre-arranged event that serves as a deadline for the completion of the full evaluation report.

Your detailed evaluation report will form the bedrock of other formats for summarizing and reporting evaluation results, including the following:

— an executive summary of the evaluation report
— a slide presentation
— a briefing
— a brochure
— a website
— an article in a newsletter
— a radio or television spot.

Many of these options can be presented in electronic and hardcopy formats.

5.1 Disseminating the findings

The evaluation team should take a practical and creative approach to dissemination – the process of communicating evaluation methods and findings to relevant audiences in a timely, unbiased and consistent manner. Staff should share ideas early on in the evaluation process about what steps they will take to ensure evaluation findings are used to inform programme improvement and expansion efforts.
Planning for the dissemination and utilization of evaluation findings builds on previous efforts to engage stakeholders, develop the multisectoral action plan and focus the evaluation design. Having a clear picture of the plan, stakeholder interests, and evaluation priorities and activities will help the evaluation team identify appropriate strategies for sharing and utilizing the findings.

Regardless of how communications are constructed, the goal for dissemination is to achieve full disclosure and impartial reporting. The tips provided in this section will help the evaluation team develop and carry out a dissemination strategy that best suits the plan.

Above all, the presentation of the evaluation should always be linked to the initial aims and objectives, as well as to the target audiences. There is a variety of ways of presenting results, but a detailed written report forms a useful resource of information for use in other formats, such as oral presentations, press releases, and media communication.

The knowledge, needs and interests of the target audience(s) will determine the information to be included in the report. Depending on the target audience, the level and scope of content can vary even when addressing the same issues. For some audiences it may be necessary to outline the background and the reach of the plan and the objectives of the intervention(s). For those involved in the project, this may not be necessary. However, the objectives of the evaluation should always be clearly set out.

**MSAP DEVELOPMENT ACTION 19:**
Disseminate the findings of the evaluation

5.2 Utilizing the results of evaluation

It is helpful to strategize with stakeholders early in the evaluation process to ensure that findings are used to improve the plan. That way, as important evaluation findings are produced, the evaluation team can work with programme staff to apply them in a timely and efficient manner.

Several practical steps can be taken to help ensure evaluation findings are used to improve the MSAP framework and implementation. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

— Use regularly scheduled meetings with evaluation stakeholders as a forum for sharing evaluation findings in real time, and developing recommendations for programme improvement based on these evaluation findings.

— Encourage programme directors and/or programme coordinators to include a review of evaluation findings and recommendations in regularly scheduled staff meetings.

— If resources allow, identify a programme staff member to coordinate, document, and monitor the efforts that programme staff and partners are making to implement improvement recommendations.
**Key messages**

— Key stakeholders should be involved in the evaluation of the implementation of a multisectoral action plan.
— The reason for an evaluation and its intended users should be defined at the outset.
— The focus of an evaluation will be different, depending on what stage the plan is at.
— Process evaluations document the implementation, and help show how outcomes and impact are being achieved.
— Outcome evaluations assess the effectiveness of the plan in changing the circumstances of those the plan is designed to benefit.
— Evaluation questions should reflect the purpose of the evaluation and the priorities and needs of the stakeholders.
— Progress evaluation questions are concerned with how well the plan is being implemented in general.
— Process evaluation questions are primarily concerned with the actual delivery of the plan – its governance and implementation.
— Outcome evaluation questions are concerned with the effects of the delivery and operations of the plan on the target population.
— The evaluation will need a source of funding and a budget.
— The evaluation will need a team to manage it.
— Methods for collecting data need to be appropriate to the data and for obtaining answers to the evaluation questions posed.
— Both quantitative and qualitative data can be used to answer the evaluation questions posed by stakeholders.
— Recommendations may need to be made about future action, such as capacity building, the raising of additional funding, and further engagement with stakeholders.
— A full-findings report will be a helpful resource from which to extract a summary and key findings for dissemination.
— Disseminating evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders and other interested parties can fulfil a range of objectives.
— The main audience for your findings will affect the method and timing of the communication.
— It is helpful to strategize with stakeholders early in the evaluation process to ensure that findings are used to improve the plan.
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Annex A. MSAP DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

- Download the MSAP template and forms [here](#).

### ACTION 15: Work with stakeholders to frame the evaluation

- **Step 1: Decide on what you want to evaluate**
  - Are you evaluating overall progress, process, or outcomes?
  - Consider the context of the priorities and needs of the stakeholders.

- **Step 2: Decide on which components/activities of the MSAP you should focus on**
  - Refer to Form 5.1 for potential areas for consideration.

- **Step 3: Develop your evaluation questions and related indicators**
  - Record them on Form 5.1.

### ACTION 16: Work with stakeholders to plan data collection

- **Step 1: Identify suitable data sources for the indicators framed in Action 15**
  - Record them on Form 5.2.

- **Step 2: For each data source, decide on a data collection method**
  - Record them on Form 5.2.

### ACTION 17: Liaise with project staff over analysis of results

You may need to establish subgroups of stakeholders to work on individual evaluation questions, or groups of questions. Use Form 5.3 to focus discussion.

- **Step 1: Discuss the data collected and the conclusions that can be drawn from it**

- **Step 2: Make a collective judgement of the answers to the evaluation questions**
  - Fill in the first two columns of Form 5.3.

- **Step 3: Elaborate on your answers, focusing on strengths, gaps/weaknesses, and recommendations**
  - Fill in the remaining columns of Form 5.3.
ACTION 18: Prepare an evaluation report
Annex B in this module provides a possible structure for the report.
Form 5.4 provides a checklist of characteristics to help you ensure that your report communicates successfully with your target audience.

ACTION 19: Disseminate the findings of the evaluation
You may need to establish a core team of communication specialists for this action.
Form 5.5 can be used to record how to disseminate your findings.

✦ Step 1: Identify the target audiences or groups of stakeholders with whom the findings will be shared
✦ Step 2: Identify suitable formats and channels for sharing the findings
✦ Step 3: Discuss the timing, style, tone and message of the information products you will need to create
✦ Step 4: Gain approval at the appropriate level for your plans for dissemination
✦ Step 5: Enter the approved plan into the Evaluation section of the MSAP template
✦ Step 6: Disseminate the findings of the evaluation

ACTION 20: Utilize the results of the evaluation
✦ Step 1: Work with stakeholders of the MSAP to establish ways in which the recommendations from the evaluation can be shared with them and with team members
✦ Step 2: Identify a team member to be responsible for recording actions taken to address and implement the recommendations
   — Provide them with Form 5.6 on which they can record efforts made to implement the recommendations for improvement (date, department, contact name, recommendation, action).
✦ Step 3: Record the actions in the MSAP template

CHECKLIST
✦ Use the Checklist available here to make sure you have completed all the necessary steps.
Annex B. Proposed structure of a report evaluating implementation of an MSAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Example/description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive summary</td>
<td>Summary of the MSAP evaluation including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o general introduction to the context and implementation of the MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o main achievements and strengths &amp; weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o conclusion and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Description of the MSAP that clarifies all the components, aims, targets and objectives, and intended outcomes of the national MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for evaluation</td>
<td>Description of evaluation design and methods that include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o how relevant stakeholders were engaged with during the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the evaluation framework used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the evaluation focuses used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the indicators used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o methods of data collection and any issues relating to quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Description of the evaluation limitations such as limited data, low response rate, etc, and how limitations were managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF MSAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall progress</td>
<td>Description of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the context in which the MSAP operates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o overall progress in implementing the MSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress toward achieving the targets and objectives</td>
<td>Description of the targets being fully, partially or not met, and the reasons behind this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS IN MAIN STRATEGIC AREAS OF NCD PREVENTION AND CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in national NCD governance</td>
<td>Account of whether the actions/interventions of this area were fully, partially or not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and discussion of main achievements in key issues, such as advocacy, NCD leadership, national coordination and international cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of challenges and issues that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in reduction of risk factors</td>
<td>Account of whether the actions/interventions of this area were fully, partially or not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and discussion of main achievements in reducing major risk factors, including tobacco use, alcohol use, physical inactivity and unhealthy diet, and other risk factors included in the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of challenges and issues that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in NCD management</td>
<td>Account of whether the actions/interventions of this area were fully, partially or not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and discussion of main achievements in management of the main diseases, including cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, cancer, chronic respiratory diseases, and other diseases included in the plan, in addition to key areas including palliative care and health system strengthening for NCDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of challenges and issues that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in NCD surveillance</td>
<td>Account of whether the actions/interventions of this area were fully, partially or not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and discussion of main achievements in implementation of activities related to collection of NCD information, such as strengthening national health information system, health examination survey, national health system response, monitoring and evaluating of NCD programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of challenges and issues that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in NCD research</td>
<td>Account of whether the actions/interventions of this area were fully, partially or not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and discussion of main achievements in NCD research, such as prioritized research agenda, capacity building for research and establishment of research network and increasing research funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of challenges and issues that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Description of the key achievements and key factors that support progress or impose barriers to the implementation of the MSAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion and recommendations</td>
<td>Description of the conclusions drawn from the evaluation and policy implications for future NCD plans and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td>Discussion of other important issues related to the MSAP evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>