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**Q1. To what extent would a Program manager be challenged when determining which indicators to employ in Monitoring and evaluating a project?**

Indicators are an essential component of any effective monitoring and evaluation process. It is therefore important that managers have to work out a set of indicators that will be used to measure outputs against program goals. Understandably, questions often arise regarding what indicators are, their importance and what to consider when choosing them.

According to Gage, Ali and Suzuki (2005) indicators are clues, signs or markers that measure one aspect of a program and show how close a program is to its desired path and outcomes. Indicators are realistic and measurable criteria of project progress. They should be defined before the project starts, so as to allow monitoring and evaluation of a project to see to it that it does what it is supposed to do.

Cogill (2001) states that, it is important that the project manager should select indicators carefully and systematically at the beginning of any project. It is also important to consider the context or the environment in which they will be deployed. As well as to take into account any existing or applicable indicator frameworks that are relevant to the context without which it will be difficult for a program manager to determine the indicator to employ. In addition, all potential indicators should be evaluated using the international indicator standards to ensure that they can and will provide useful data. They should be drawn from harmonized and widely used indicator sets that have a successful track record.

According to Rogers (2009) persons with limited evaluation experience often are bewildered by the process of selecting indicators to employ in monitoring and evaluating a project. The following are the challenges that a project manager can face when determining which indicators to employ in monitoring and evaluating a project; lack of experience, limited financial and staff resources, gaps in technical knowledge with regard to defining performance indicators, the retrieval, collection, preparation and interpretation of data and inefficient monitoring and evaluation practice.

Whenever a program manager wants to employ an indicator to be used in monitoring and evaluating a project, he or she must have some sort of experience in the field. He or she must have technical skills, failure to this it will be a constraint. Finances and staff resources is another challenge, ideal indicators might require collecting data to calculate an unknown denominator or national data to compare with project earlier data, or tracking lifetime statistics for an affected or control population (Rogers, 2009).

Programmatic and external requirements are also a challenge that a program manager can face during selection of an indicator. Indicators may be imposed from above by those not trained in monitoring and evaluation techniques. Availability of data can as well be a challenge in a way that some data may be considered privileged information by agencies, projects or government officials. Data may be available only on aggregated levels or already calculated into indicators that may not be the ideal indicators for the program or activities (Cogill, 2001).

According to Core (2006) when selecting indicators, it is essential to understand the context in which they will be used in order to select the most appropriate ones. Specifically, a country must have a good grasp of its epidemic and response when selecting indicators. For example, if a country has a concentrated epidemic among a population at higher risk, such as injecting drug users, Monitoring and Evaluation professionals need to understand the dynamics of the epidemic, including the behaviors that drive it and the activities that are effective in addressing it, before identifying indicators to monitor the epidemic and response.

In conclusion when selecting indicators, it is important to consider the long-term as well as the short-term objectives and how each will be measured. A program manager consider the following when selecting an indicator to use; relevance, accuracy, importance, usefulness, feasibility, credibility, validity and distinctiveness. Without which selecting an indicator to be employed in monitoring and evaluating will be a challenge.

**Q2. Citing key characteristics of indicators, explain the fundamental differences between output and outcome indicators**.

In monitoring and evaluation planning, one of the things that managers have to work out is a set of indicators that will be used to measure outputs against program goals. Understandably, questions often arise regarding what indicators are, there importance and what to consider when choosing them. There are three widely acknowledged types of indicators and these are; process indicators, outcome indicators and impact indicators. Therefore, this essay will explain the fundamental differences between output and outcome indicators.

According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and developments (2010) indicators that tell us whether the activities and actions we have planned are actually as intended known as output indicators or qualitative indicators. Output indicators are the first level the first level of results associated with a project. Often confused with activities, outputs are the direct immediate term results associated with a project. In other words, they are usually what a project has achieved in a short term. An easy way to think about outputs is to quantify the project activities that have a direct link on the project goal. For instance, project outputs in an HIV/AIDS project would be the number of community awareness meetings that were done.

Bastia (2000) states that, output indicators also known as qualitative indicators or performance indicators are the second level of results associated with a project and refers to the medium term consequences of the project. Outcomes usually relate to the project goal or aim. For example, in a safe water project an outcome would be the percentage of household that are using chlorinated drinking water. Another outcome would be the percentage of children suffering from diarrhea. Nevertheless, an important point to note is that, outcomes should clearly link to the project goals.

According to Casley (1988) output indicators are those results which are achieved immediately after implementing an activity. For example, if we are organizing a workshop on human rights, participants who attended it have now got a clear outstanding on human rights issues. While, outcome indicators can be considered as mid-term results. They are not seen immediately after the end of the project activity. But after sometime, when we see some change at the ground level because of the project activity then it can be termed as an outcome. Taking the above example of the human rights results workshop, if the participants have started to mobilize their community members to seek their human rights then, it is an outcome of the project.

Roche (1999) highlights that, there are differences between output indicators and outcome indicators. Outputs are information, products, or results produced by undertaking projects activities like Selecting of communities and schools to be involved in project, Formation of peer groups, Recruitment of peer educators. Outputs relate to completion of activities and are the type of results over which managers have a high degree of influence. Outputs reflect what you hoped to produce from a particular input (or set of inputs). Outputs usually reflect a result achieved in a relatively short time period (0–2 years). Examples of outputs would include; Trained peer educators, formed and active peer groups, Community members trained and Condoms distributed. They measure the most immediate or delivered outputs of a development intervention (during and at the end of implementation).

They also highlight the physical quantities of goods produced or services supplied through the development intervention. Not only that, they highlight the number of beneficiaries having had access to or received these goods or services produced by the development intervention.

Output measurement shows the realization of activities. Outcome measurement shows in what degree direct objectives and anticipated results are realized. And impact assessment shows the degree in which the overall objective or goal of the program is realized. Without defining clear and measurable goals, objectives and activities at the design stage, M&E becomes an impossible endeavor. This requires the development of measurable indicators: Specific, Measurable, Achievable/Agreed upon, Relevant/Realistic, Time-bound (SMART) that permit objective verification at a reasonable cost (Roche, 1999).

Woodhill (2006) also adds that, Output indicators monitor the production of goods and delivery of services by the project. They are often evaluated and reported with the use of performance measures based on cost or operational ratios. For example: kilometers of all-weather highway completed by a given date; percentage of farmers attending a crop demonstration site before fertilizer top-dressing; number of teachers trained in textbook use; cost per kilometer of road construction; crop yield per hectare; ratio of textbooks to pupils; time taken to process a credit application; number of demonstrations managed per extension worker; steps in the process of establishing water-users’ associations.

On the other hand, Outcome indicators are immediate impact of the outputs of the projects on the community. Outcomes help us answer the “so what?” question, for example we trained 100people in behavior change and increased their knowledge but did they change their behavior? Outcomes often reflect behavior or economic change. Outcomes usually reflect aresult achieved over a short or intermediate time period, 2–5 years. Examples of outcomes from a BCC project include: More accurately informed community on HIV/AIDS issues (transmission, prevention ), More skilled and assertive people on HIV/AIDS e.g. girls saying no or negotiating forsafer sex, Increased condom use*,* Less stigma in communityandIncreased number of people in community testing for their HIV status.They help in measuring the short and medium term effects (or outcomes) resulting from beneficiary use of outputs/outcomes produced through the development intervention (Bastia, 2000).

Generally, they highlight a change in behaviour, attitude, practices or an improvement in skills and capacities. Besides that, they can also be used to measure a change in preferences or the satisfaction of beneficiaries with regard to the quality of received goods and services

Rogers (2009) also adds that, outcomes determinesthe intermediate changes that a program effects on target audiences or populations, such as change in knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, skills, behaviors, access to services, policies and environmental conditions.

Outcome indicators are specific to a project’s purpose and the logical chain of cause and effect that underlies its design. Often achievement of outcomes will depend at least in part on the actions of beneficiaries in responding to project outputs, and indicators will depend on data collected from beneficiaries for instance, change in crop yields or cropping pattern, and investment by farmers in land management improvements. It will usually be important for project management to try to gain early indications of project performance in achieving outcomes through the use of leading indicators of outcomes. These may often be obtained by surveying beneficiaries’ perceptions of project outputs and services, perceptions of improved reliability of irrigation supply, proportion of farmers who have tried a new variety of seed and intend to use it again; percentage of women satisfied with the maternity health care they receive. Such leading indicators have the twin advantages of consultation with primary stakeholders and advance warning of poor project performance (The Organization for Economic Co-operation and developments, 2010).

In conclusion while output indicators are the first level of results associated with a project, the outcomes are the second level associated with a project. Outputs do not address the impact or value of the services, the outcome is reflected by the level of achievement or performance that occurred due to the activities or services provided. Another difference is that outcomes are not an appropriate indicator of effectiveness. An outcome on the other hand, is an appropriate measure of effectiveness.

**Q3.Organization XYT, based in Juba, South Sudan is funded by DFID to roll out mass measles campaign targeting all children under the age of 5. Key activities include setting up maternal care resource centers, providing information to key opinion leaders on value of child immunization; procurement of cold chain boxes; development of IEC materials for the public sensitizations and actual immunization; working from the known to the unknown, develop a project outline, with a maximum of 3 output indicators; 3 outcome indicators and 2 impact indicators.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | THEORY OF CHANGE | INDICATORS |
| Activities | The Organization XYT will   * Set up maternal care resource centers. * Provide information to key opinion leaders on value of child immunization * procure cold chain boxes * develop IEC materials for the public sensitizations and actual immunization | * Number of material care resource centers. * Number of leaders who information is being provided to. * Number of cold chain boxes procured. * Number of IEC materials provided. |
| |  | | --- | | Outputs | | As a result…   * This will help to roll out mass measles campaign targeting all children under the age of 5. | * Number of incidents reported and has health babies. * Change in the proportion of babies in the area experiencing measles. * Extent to which women and girls in the catchment areas of stations included in the project perceive policing services to be more accessible.(those who are in a bearing age) |
| |  | | --- | | Outcomes | | This will lead to…   * Help in having healthy babies by the mothers if child immunization is conducted in the area. | * Number of healthy babies increased. * Number measles cases reduced. * Number of children immunized in a week increased. |
| Impacts | And contribute to…   * A reduction in the overall rates of infant mortality rate in the area. | * Change in the incidence of measles attack in infants. * Changes in the perceptions of risk of measles in infants and the population will be free from this disease. * Change in the rates of attacks in the community. |

**Q4: Work-plan and indicator development:**

**Your organization, Malakal Community Empowerment Organization (MACEPO) has received a funding of SSP 50,000 to undertake a project on reintegrating returnees into their original family systems. The project involves among others, trainings in family reunions and reintegration for village elders, opinion leaders, pastors, youth and vigilante groups. It also entails provision of seeds, fertilizers and other startup tools for livelihoods such as funds for small businesses to the returnees. It also involves group meetings for returnees on family reintegration and reunion.**

**Develop a 3-month work plan with SMART objectives, specific activities, assigned budgets and process and outcome indicators to facilitate effective management, monitoring and evaluation. Present your work in a tabular form.**

**THREE (3) MONTH WORK-PLAN FOR REINTEGRATING RETURNEES INTO THEIR ORIGINAL FAMILY SYSTEM**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective 1:  Reintegration of unaccompanied, separated, missing children & other vulnerable men & women to live a dignified life in MACEPO | **Project location** | **Unit** | **Qnty** | Unit price | Total Amt(SSP) | **Q1** | | |
| Outcome 1: unaccompanied, separated & missing children or returnees reunited with their family members | MACEPO |  |  |  |  | Jan | Feb | Mar |
| Indicators 1: Number of identified, registered & separated/unaccompanied children reunited with their families or alternative care arrangement assured from the beginning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1:  Training in family reunions & reintegration for village elders, pastors, youth & vigilante groups |  | Persons | 15 | 900 | 13,500SSP | yes |  |  |
| Objective 2:  Improve the living conditions of the returnees families by providing small scale business opportunities | MACEPO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2: Empower & strengthen the capacity of women, men, boys &girls increase they coping mechanism through the livelihood activities in MACEPO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: At least 5 groups comprising of 5 members each engage in self-help activities to improve income & livelihood by the end of project year 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 2:** At least 5 groups comprising of 5 members each engage in self-help activities to improve income & livelihood by the end of project year 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Activity 2:**  Provision of seeds, fertilizers and other startup tools for livelihoods such as fund for small businesses to the returnees. |  | groups | 5 | 2,400 | 12,000SSP |  | yes |  |
| **Objective 3:**  Protection needs of the most vulnerable returnees are identified through effective & regular monitoring meetings, reporting & responses including promoting safe environment. | MACEPO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:** Improve health of the returnees’ families and peaceful coexistence with the host families or original families. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 3:** Number of reintegrated & reunion families receiving psychosocial support and counseling services from the 1st month of the project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Activity 3:**  Group meetings for returnees on family reintegration & reunion |  | persons | 20 | 1000 | 20,000SSP |  |  | yes |
| **Activity 4:** Monitoring | MACEPO | Monthly | 3 | 1,500 | 4,500 |  | yes | yes |
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