**ASSIGNMENT ONE**

1. Giving examples differentiate between Monitoring and Evaluation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Monitoring** | **Evaluation** |
| Monitoring is the systematic and routine collection of information about the programs/projects activities | Evaluation is the periodic assessment of the programs/projects activities |
| It is ongoing process which is done to see if things/activities are going on track or not i.e. it regularly tracks the program | It is done on a periodic basis to measure the success against the objective i.e. it is an in-depth assessment of the program |
| Monitoring is to be done starting from the initial stage of the projects | Evaluation is to be done after certain point of time of the project, usually at the mid of the project, completion of the project or while moving from one stage to another stage of the projects/programs |
| Monitoring is done usually by the internal members of the team | Evaluation is done mainly done by the external members. However, sometimes it may be also done by  internal members of the team or by both internal and external members in a combined way |
| Monitoring provides information about the current status and thus helps to take immediate remedial actions, if necessary | Evaluation provides recommendations, information for long term planning and lessons for organizational growth and success |
| It focuses on input, activities and output | It focuses on outcomes, impacts and overall goal |
| Monitoring process includes regular meetings, interview, monthly and quarterly reviews etc. Usually quantitative data. | Evaluation process includes intense data collection, both qualitative and quantitative |
| It has multiple points of data collection | Data collection is done at intervals only |
| It gives answer about the present scenario of the project towards achieving planned results considering the human resources, budget, materials, activities and outputs | It assesses the relevance, impact, sustainability, effectiveness and efficiency of the projects |
| Monitoring studies the present information and experiences of the project | Evaluation studies the past experience of the project performance |
| Monitoring checks whether the project did what it said it would do | Evaluation checks whether what the project did had the impact that it intended |
| Helps to improve project design and functioning of current project | Helps to improve project design of future projects |
| Monitoring looks at detail of activities | Evaluation does not look at detail of activities but rather looks at a bigger picture |
| It compares the current progress with the planned progress | It looks at the achievement of the programs along with both positive/negative, intended/unintended effects |
| Information obtained from monitoring is more useful to the implementation/management team | Information obtained from evaluation is useful to all the stakeholders |
| Monitoring result is used for informed actions and decisions | Evaluation result is used for planning of new programs and interventions |
| Answers the question “Are we doing things right?” | Answers the question “Are we doing right thing?” |
| Regular report and updates about the project/program act a deliverables here | Reports with recommendations and lessons act as a deliverable here |
| Good or effective monitoring does not rely on evaluation results | Good or effective evaluation relies to some extent on good monitoring |
| There are few quality checks in monitoring | There are many quality checks in evaluation |
| It provides information for evaluation | It provides information for proper planning |

1. **Why is Baseline survey an important part in Project Management?**

Baseline surveys are those surveys carried out before project implementation start to generate data about the existing situation of a target area or group. Such data becomes the reference against which project/program impact can be assessed when summative evaluations are carried out. For example, if the objective of the project is to reduce school dropout rates, we have to know those rates prior to project implementation and compare them with rates after the completion of the project.

Baseline surveys are especially important when the pretest posttest evaluation model is adopted. The logic behind carrying out baseline surveys is that by comparing data that describe the situation to be addressed by a project or a program and data generated after the completion of the project, evaluators would be able to measure progress or changes in the

Situation and link those changes to project interventions. As well, baseline data might be useful to track changes that the project would bring about over time and to refine project indicators that are important for project monitoring or for evaluating project impact.

Baseline surveys are especially important for assessing project higher-level objectives. Special focus is given to gathering information about various indicators developed to measure project effects. Both quantitative and qualitative information are used in baseline surveys (see next section). To control biases in methodological indicators, methods and tools used in the baseline survey should be repeated when carrying out summative evaluations.

1. Distinguish between Summative and formative evaluation Methods with examples.

**Formative evaluations** (process evaluations) examine the development of the project and may lead to changes in the way the project is structured and carried out. Those types of evaluations are often called interim evaluations. One of the most commonly used formative evaluations is the midterm evaluation.

In general, formative evaluations are process oriented and involve a systematic collection of information to assist decision-making during the planning or implementation stages of a program. They usually focus on operational activities, but might also take a wider perspective and possibly give some consideration to long-term effects. While staff members directly responsible for the activity or project are usually involved in planning and implementing formative evaluations, external evaluators might also be engaged to bring new approaches or perspectives. Questions typically asked in those evaluations include:

• To what extent do the activities and strategies correspond with those presented in the plan? If they are not in harmony, why are there changes? Are the changes justified?

• To what extent did the project follow the timeline presented in the work plan?

• Are activities carried out by the appropriate personnel?

• To what extent are project actual costs in line with initial budget allocations?

• To what extent is the project moving toward the anticipated goals and objectives of the project?

• Which of the activities or strategies are more effective in moving toward achieving the goals and objectives?

• What barriers were identified? How and to what extent were they dealt with?

What are the main strengths and weaknesses of the project?

• To what extent are beneficiaries of the project active in decision-making and implementation?

• To what extent do project beneficiaries have access to services provided by the project? What are the obstacles?

• To what extent are the project beneficiaries satisfied with project services?

**Summative evaluations** (also called outcome or impact evaluations) address the second set of issues. They look at what a project has actually accomplished in terms of its stated goals. There are two types of summative evaluations. (1) End evaluations aim to establish the situation when external aid is terminated and to identify the possible need for follow up activities either by donors or project staff. (2) Ex-post evaluations are carried out two to five years after external support is terminated. The main purpose is to assess what lasting impact the project has had or is likely to have and to extract lessons of experience.

**Summative evaluation questions include**:

• To what extent did the project meet its overall goals and objectives?

• What impact did the project have on the lives of beneficiaries?

• Was the project equally effective for all beneficiaries?

• What components were the most effective?

• What significant unintended impacts did the project have?

• Is the project replicable?

• Is the project sustainable?

1. **Monitoring and evaluation uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to measure the success and impact of the projects. However, economists and staticians adapt a one sided method (quantitative) to analyze the results**.
   1. Identify the potential dangers of a one sided monitoring system.

1 -The results may only be accepted by one party.  
2 - There could be potential bias in the individual conducting the evaluation.  
3 - It may lower the morale of employees since all factors all not considered when conducting the evaluation potentially giving a wrong report at the end.  
4 - May bring mistrust issues due to the employees may feel that they are not well incorporated in the evaluation.

* 1. **Critically analyze the quantitative method often employed by economists and staticians in monitoring and evaluating development projects**.

Monitoring and evaluation uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to measure the success and impact of the projects. However, economists and statisticians adapt a one sided method (quantitative) to analyze the results

1. **A.** **Define Logical Framework**

The logical framework or log frame is a document that gives an overview of the [objectives](https://www.logframer.eu/content/designing-project-main-logic), [activities](https://www.logframer.eu/content/activities) and [resources](https://www.logframer.eu/content/project’s-inputs-resources-and-budget) of a project. It also provides information about external elements that may influence the project, called [assumptions](https://www.logframer.eu/content/identifying-risks-and-assumptions). Finally, it tells you how the project will be monitored, through the use of [/content/indicators](https://www.logframer.eu/content/indicators). All this information is presented in a table with four columns and four rows.

**B. Define and Explain key components of Logical framework**

The log frame consists of a 4 x 4 matrix with four column headings: Objective or narrative summary/ hierarchy of objectives; objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs)/ measurable performance indicators; Means of verification/ **monitoring** and coordination.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Narrative Summary** | **Verifiable Indicators(OVI)** | **Means of Verification Sources (MOV)** | **Important Assumptions** |
| **Goals** |  |  |  |
| **Purpose** |  |  |  |
| **Outputs** |  |  |  |
| **Activities** | **Input** |  |  |

**References**

Source: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), who Are the Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook, OESP Handbook Series, 1997.

(UNICEF, A UNICEF Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation: Making a Difference?, New York, 1991, p. 40.)

UNESCO (2010). Assessing Education Data Quality in the Southern African Development Community (SADC): A Synthesis of Seven Country Assessment. Windhoek: Solitaire Press

MCA-N. (2011). Guidance for MCA-N Grantees’ M&E Plans. Windhoek. Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E. & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). Evaluation: A Systematic approach. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Meyer, M. (2002). Managing Human Resource Development: an outcomes-based approach (2ndEd). Durban: LexisNexis Butterworth.

Australia Government (2005). AusGuideline: Associated guidance on Programmed Strategies. AusAid.

Bastia, T. (2000). Qualitative and Quantitative indicators of the ILO Gender Mainstreaming Strategies. Available: [www.womeng.net/wp/library/Methodology%20Indicators.pdf](http://www.womeng.net/wp/library/Methodology%20Indicators.pdf)