**WHAT WE DID**

- **Literature review** of 194 abstracts including peer reviewed journals and grey literature
- **7 articles** met the inclusion criteria
- **Direct communication** with ECB/evaluation experts and researchers
- **Worked with** Dr. Isabelle Bourgeois, PHD to adapt, test and pilot the tool. Instrument was tested by the project advisory committee and then piloted by 4 PHUs.
- **32/36 PHUs** agreed to complete the organizational Self-Assessment Evaluation Capacity Instrument.

**WHAT WE FOUND**

- **6 organizational EC assessment instruments** were reviewed.
- Workgroup **selected the Bourgeois, Toews, Whynot, & Lamarche (2013) Organizational EC Assessment Instrument.**

**WHAT WE DID**

- **Assessed** 6 dimensions and 19 sub-dimensions divided into the **Capacity to DO** and the **Capacity to USE** evaluation categories:  
  - Human resources
  - Organizational resources
  - Evaluation plan and activities
  - Evaluation literacy
  - Organizational decision-making
  - Learning benefits

- **Conducted** key informant interviews to assess overall staff capacity including evaluation staff, evaluation framework and processes, communication and use of findings, and constraints.

**WHAT WE FOUND**

- **Quantitative**
  - Of 32 Public Health Units:
    - 1 is in the **LOW** category
    - 26 are in the **DEVELOPING** category
    - 5 are in the **INTERMEDIATE** category

- **Qualitative**
  - Evaluation frameworks and clearly defined evaluation processes are important.
  - **Management** is more aware of the importance of evaluation to the organization as a whole.
  - PHUs with stronger evaluation capacity tend to use their evaluation findings for decision-making.
  - The overall size of the PHU, the population density and the PHU structure **do not appear to affect EC.**

---

EC = Evaluation Capacity  
ECB = Evaluation Capacity Building  
PHU = Public Health Unit

---
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