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**ASSIGNMENT**

1. Giving examples differentiate between Monitoring and Evaluation.
2. Why is Baseline survey an important part in Project Management?
3. Distinguish between Summative and formative evaluation Methods with examples.
4. 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.
   2. Critically analyze the quantitative method often employed by economists and staticians in monitoring and evaluating development projects
5. a. Define Logical Framework

b. Define and Explain key components of Logical framework

**Differences between Monitoring and Evaluation**

1. According to ***A Step by Step Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation (2014)-version 1.0,*** monitoring refers to the collection and analysis of information about a project or program, undertaken while the project or program is on-going whereas evaluation refers to the periodic and retrospective assessment of an organization, project or program that might be conducted internally or by external independent evaluators. Though it is clear that monitoring and evaluation are differentbut yet complimentary as monitoring and evaluation are important management tools that are necessary to track the progress of projects/programs, facilitate decision making for present and future interventions. **Monitoring and Evaluation** (**M&E**) is a process that helps improve performance and achieve results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. However, there are differences between M & E as follows:

* According to (*Diploma in M&E Module 1 pg. 75*), monitoring is defined as the ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards achieving their goals and objectives.
* Monitoring is the process of routinely and consistently gathering information on the project implementation with the primary focus on the achievement of intended outputs (tangible or intangible products that result from project activities). For example, the number of mosquito nets delivered to a health facility for distribution to women and the number of women who actually received the mosquito nets. Monitoring assesses the current project situation with focus on the achievement of the intended outputs e.g. the quantity of food delivered to the distribution center and the number of people actually receiving rations. This requires routine collection of information on an on-going basis to support basic management and accountability functions.
* While evaluation is essentially an assessment to measure the extent to which a project is achieving or has achieved its stated outcomes or measure the extent to which a project causes actual changes in conditions towards the overall project goal, e.g. improvement in food security status at the beneficiary level.
* Monitoring is necessary to detect changes in contextual factors that may necessitate program adjustment. On the other hand, evaluation results are critical to guide the management of current activities, to inform resource allocation decisions across project components and to support the design or re-design of future interventions to maximize their potential impacts.
* Monitoring means keeping track of what you are doing while you are doing it, so that you can take corrective action if necessary. Evaluation means finding out if you have achieved the effect on your target population that you said you would achieve, after you have finished implementing the activities. This distinction is not completely clear-cut, and a good evaluation will rely on good monitoring.
* The monitoring is a short term assessment and does not take into consideration the outcomes and impact unlike the evaluation process which also assesses the outcomes and sometime longer term impact.
* Evaluation is a systematic and objective examination which is conducted on monthly, yearly basis, unlike Monitoring which is continuous assessment providing stakeholders with early information. Monitoring checks on all the activities on the last [implementation stage] unlike Evaluation which entails information on whether the donated funds are well managed and that they are transparently spent.

Baselines survey is an important part for any project management for the following reasons:

1. ***It is a starting point for a project:*** One important, and recommended, way of starting a project is to carry out a baseline study. Through its results, a baseline serves as a benchmark for all future activities, where project managers can refer to for the purposes of making project management decisions.
2. ***Establishing priority areas/planning:*** Baseline studies are important in establishing priority areas for a project. This is especially true when a project has several objectives. The results of a baseline study can show some aspects of a project need more focus than other while others may only need to be given little focus. Take for example a project on HIV and AIDS in Dhaka. A baseline study may show that while there is generally high public information on awareness of risk and prevention strategies, these strategies are either non-existent or inaccessible. In this case, project output would focus more on improving access to prevention strategies and little on doing media campaigns and community mobilization.
3. ***Attribution:***Without a baseline, it is not possible to know the impact of a project. A baseline study serves the purpose of informing decision makers what impact the project has had on the target community. Accordingly, along with other strategies such as use of [control groups](https://evaluateblog.wordpress.com/2013/05/05/selecting-a-control-group-in-evaluations-randomized-control-trials/), it also helps in attributing change in the target population to the project.
4. ***Baseline tools are used for evaluation:*** the tools used during a baseline study are normally the same tools used during evaluation. This is important for ensuring that management compares “apples to apples”. As such, conducting a baseline means that time and other resources for designing evaluation tools are minimized or even eliminated altogether.
5. ***Donor requirement:*** In most cases, it is a donor requirement that a baseline study is carried out as part of the program process. Since M&E is integral for any donor to establish future project success, they might, and always do compel implementing organizations to carry out baseline studies.

**Other things to consider when conducting baseline studies**

***1. Indicators:*** Before conducting a baseline study, it is important to identify the [indicators](https://evaluateblog.wordpress.com/2013/05/25/selecting-project-indicators/) for the project. The indicators help in the designing of the questionnaire and also in determining evaluation indicators. The type of indicators could also dictate the type of data to collect and how the analysis of the data will be done.

***2. Study population and sampling:*** The study population is most often the project target population. Establishing the boundary so as to ensure the sample is only limited to the target population is important. Also related is the sampling procedure. The most common one is the simple random sampling. However, sometimes this is not possible because of various reasons, which might mean that a different sampling procedure is considered.

***3. Partners:***In some cases, it could necessary to involve other organizations in the baseline survey. This is especially viable if “similar” projects share a starting timeline and share a target group, most often by projects sharing a donor. This normally saves costs an increases confidence in the baseline results.

***4. Funds:***Availability of funds will dictate the intensity and scope of the baseline study. More funds might also mean that both quantitative and qualitative methods are adopted, while limited funds might imply that an organization only goes for quantitative methods.

**Summative and formative evaluation Methods with examples.**

Although the definitions have become confusing in the past few years both summative and formative evaluation methods are an integral part of information gathering.

**Summative Evaluation:** is an assessment done periodically to determine at a particular point in time what students know and do not know.Summative evaluation at the national/classroom level is an accountability measure that is generally used as part of the grading process.

The goal of summative evaluation is to assess student learning at the end of an instructional unit by comparing it against some standard or benchmark.

Summative evaluations are often high stakes, which means that they have a high point value. Examples of summative evaluations include:

* a midterm exam
* End-of-term or semester exams
* Scores that are used for accountability for schools and students (report card grades).
* a final project
* a paper
* a senior recital

Summative evaluations are tools to help evaluate the effectiveness of programs, school improvement goals, alignment of curriculum, or student placement in specific programs. Summative evaluations happen too far down the learning path to provide information at the classroom level and to make instructional adjustments and interventions during the learning process.

Information from summative evaluations can be used formatively when students or faculty use it to guide their efforts and activities in subsequent courses.

**Formative Evaluation**

The goal of formative evaluation is to monitor student learning to provide ongoing feedback that can be used by instructors to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning. More specifically, formative evaluations:

* Help students identify their strengths and weaknesses and target areas that need work
* Help faculty recognize where students are struggling and address problems immediately

Formative evaluations are generally low stakes, which means that they have low or no point value. Examples of formative assessments include asking students to:

* draw a concept map in class to represent their understanding of a topic
* submit one or two sentences identifying the main point of a lecture
* turn in a research proposal for early feedback

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.

b. The potential dangers of a one sided monitoring system include the following:

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 are not considered when conducting the evaluation potentially giving a wrong report at the end.
4. This may bring mistrust and other issues that could make employees feel that they are not well incorporated in the evaluation.
   1. Quantitative method is often employed by economists and statisticians typically to explore specific and clearly defined questions that examine the relationship between two events, or occurrences, where the second event is a consequence of the first event.

In recent years there have been increasing demands to measure the effectiveness of international development projects. This demand has emerged in response to two concerns: (1) Heightened criticism that most development agencies report only their outputs (e.g., number of teachers trained, kilometers of roads built) rather than outcomes; and (2) Concerns that, despite assurances that development resources have contributed to the reduction of illiteracy and poverty, little reliable information has actually been presented to show that this is in fact the case. This has led to a demand for more effective and innovative ways to monitor and evaluate the nature and extent of impacts stemming from development initiatives (Rao and Woolcock 2003).

There has been an explosion of quantitative impact evaluations of program interventions in international development.

Economists have long used quantitative methods to provide theories and explanations on why certain things happen in the market. Why a given economic system behaves the way it does. Paradoxically, none of these theories and explanations have been able to predict past and current crises. And they continue to rely on models of explanation that are essentially quantitative, ignoring the fact that individual behaviour cannot be aggregated to collective behaviour.

Some development economists (e.g., Banerjee 2007, Duflo and Kremer 2005) have gone as far as to argue that randomized trials should be central to development practice, and that knowledge claims based on alternative approaches are not merely inferior, but inherently suspect. Others (Deaton 2009, Ravallion 2008), while accepting the central importance of quantitative evaluations, question the exclusive reliance placed by the “randomistas” on randomization and make the case that careful theorizing and tests of hypothesis that derive from theory, along with other types of quantitative methodologies – propensity score matching, careful structural modeling, and instrumental variables – should not be so easily dismissed. The central concern of all these quantitative techniques is with obtaining statistically rigorous counterfactuals.

The strong claims by quantitative development researchers to have the best (the “gold standard”), or even the only acceptable way to evaluate the effectiveness of development assistance has created a strong reaction from other sectors of the development community. While some argue that randomization is rarely possible in developing countries, that the rigorous designs introduce an inflexibility that makes it difficult to understand the complex environment in which development projects operate, or that there are fundamental methodological issues with the approaches, many take the view that randomized and strong statistical designs are only one of a number of approaches to development evaluation. For example, NONIE (the Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation) recently published “NONIE Guidance on Impact Evaluation” (April 2009) which recognized the importance of rigorous quantitative methods for addressing issues of causal attribution but recommended that evaluators should use a mixed method approach that combines the strengths of a range of quantitative and qualitative methods. In the latest edition of his Utilization Focused Evaluation, Patton (2008) lays out an extensive menu of different evaluation designs that can be used to address different kinds of evaluation questions.

Most work by economists on development questions also remains entirely econometric, though there is an increasing (and welcome) trend towards direct engagement in fieldwork and having survey data be analyzed by the person(s) who collected it, which in turn has led to a deeper and richer understanding of development problems.

A frequent criticism of qualitative methods is that they use small and often non-representative samples and that qualitative methods are used for initial diagnostic studies to help develop the data collection instruments for the quantitative studies.

Definition of Logical Framework

1. According to *Bond Network for International Development, Logical Framework (Logical Framework Analysis)*, a log frame (also known as Project Framework) is a tool for planning and managing development projects with the aim to present information about the key components of a project in a clear, concise, logical and systematic way.

The logical framework provides a structure for logical thinking in project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation making the project logic explicit, by providing the means for a thorough analysis of the needs of project beneficiaries and links project objectives, strategies, inputs, and activities to the specified needs.

b. The following are the key components of Logical framework:

**Overall Objectives/Goal:** is the broad development impact to strategies, objectives to which the project contributes or the ultimate result to which the project is contributing which is the impact of the project, e.g. *To increase literacy rate among girls in Yambio County.*

**Specific Objectives/Purpose/outcome:** this is the development outcome or the direct benefits to the target group by the end of the project or the change that occurs if the project outputs are achieved, i.e. the effects of the project, e.g. *School attendance and literacy skills of girls of 6-15 year old in Yambio County is increased*.

**Expected Results/Outputs:** these refer to the direct, tangible results like goods, services etc. that the project should deliver. These are specifically intended results of the project activities – used as milestones of what has been accomplished at various stages during the life of the project. E.g. *Three new language teachers are recruited and trained*.

**Activities:** refer to all the specific tasks undertaken to achieve the required outputs or the expected results or tasks needed to achieve the output (expected results). E.g. (a) Hold training sessions for new teachers covering aims, approach, problem solving and record-keeping, (b) Conducting outreach program for families with school age children (girls) to demonstrate the benefits of literacy.

**Inputs:** refer to resources/means such as policies, personnel, finances, equipment, tools, training etc. including the contribution of the target group which are needed to carry out the activities and produce the outputs of the project.

**Indictors:** “An indicator is a marker. It can be compared to a road sign, which shows you are on the right road, how far you have traveled, and how far you still have to go in order to reach your destination” Feuerstein (1992). With reference to (*Diploma in M&E Module 1 pg. 103*), Indicators are measurable or tangible signs that something has been done or that something has been achieved.

Indicators are also referred to as measurable or objectively verifiable indicators (OVI), which are quantitative and qualitative ways of measuring progress and whether project outputs, outcomes/purpose and goal have been achieved.

Indicators also refer to the information that would help us determine progress towards meeting project objectives. An indicator should provide a clearly defined unit of measurement and a target detailing the quantity, quality and timing of expected results.

However, indicators are categorized as follows:

* **Impact Indicators:** these indicators are (*long term results*) showing progress towards achieving the overall objective measuring in terms of quantity or quality. E.g. reduction in child mortality, reduction in morbidity, or improved child nutritional status.
* **Outcome Indicators:** refer specifically to the objectives of the intervention and are (*medium term results*) showing that the objectives have been achieved in terms of quantity, quality and within the time frame.
* **Output/process Indicators:** are (*short term results*) indicators showing or measuring to which extent the expected results or stated objectives have been achieved in terms of quantity, quality and time. They measure whether planned activities took place or not.
* **Input Indicators:** refer to the resources needed for the implementation of an activity or project intervention such as policies, personnel, funding, training & training materials, equipment and tools etc.

Therefore, indicators should be SMART

**S**: Specific (outline in a clear statement precisely what is required).

**M**: Measurable (include a measure to enable you to monitor progress and to know when the objective has been achieved).

**A**: Attainable (i.e., can be checked)

**R**: Relevant (reflect changes in the situation)

**T**: Trackable (can be tracked over a specific period of time)

As such, there are dimensions of **outcome and impact indicators** of programs/projects which are interrelated in measuring their success. In order to measure the success of projects/programs, the following dimensions should be taken into consideration:

* **Effectiveness**: is the measure of the degree to which the formally stated project objectives have been achieved or can be achieved. To make such measure and verification possible, project objectives should be defined clearly and realistically, (*Diploma in M & E Module 1, pg. 28*).
* **Efficiency**: is the measure of the economic relationship between the allocated inputs and the project outputs generated from those inputs (i.e. cost effectiveness of the project). It is a measure of the productivity of the project, i.e., to what degree the outputs achieved derive from an acceptable cost. This includes the efficient use of financial, human and material resources. In other words, efficiency asks whether the use of resources in comparison with the outputs is justified, (*Diploma in M & E Module 1, pg. 29).*
* **Relevance:** is a measure used to determine the degree to which the objectives of a program or project remain valid as planned. It refers to an overall assessment to determine whether project interventions and objectives are still in harmony with the needs and priorities of beneficiaries.At this level, the following questions might be asked: (1) Are the agreed objectives of the project still valid? (2) Is there a sufficient rationale for continuing the project or activity? (3) What is the value of the project in relation to other priority needs?
* **Impact:** is a measure of all positive and negative changes and effects caused by the project, whether planned or unplanned. While effectiveness focuses only on specific positive and planned effects expected to accrue as a result of the project and is expressed in terms of the immediate objective, impact is a broader measure which includes both positive and negative project results, whether they are intended, or unintended.
* **Sustainability:** is a measure of the continuation of the project program or positive results after external support has been concluded.

**Means of Verification (MOV):** Just as the word goes; means of verification implies the way that we can confirm, as evidence, of doing what we are purporting to have done. It refers to the information or data required to assess progress against indicators and their sources or the pieces of information which shows that the standard set by the indicators has been achieved. E.g. For increased enrollment of girls in school, the means of verification would be the Ministry of Education Statistics, school enrollment figures, reports etc.

**Assumptions:** are conditions external to the project that may affect the progress or success of the project, and to which the project management has limited control.These may be climatic, political, economic etc. but should be real (possible) risks rather than a list of everything that could go wrong. However, assumptions can either be negative as cited above or positive such as peaceful environment, availability of human resource, equipment, tools, funding etc. that promote implementation of the project/program if availed within the time frame of the project period.

However, there are different logical frameworks being used by different organizations and donors but they have common key important features.

Finally, there is increasing acceptance of the idea that monitoring is as central to good development practice as evaluation. Evaluations tell us how well a project worked; monitoring provides real time feedback, allowing the project to learn by doing and to adjust design to ground-level realities.
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