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**Giving examples differentiate between Monitoring and Evaluation.**

Monitoring and Evaluation often get grouped together and understood as the same process. My discussions on Monitoring and Evaluation will be based on how the two differ in their applications in the development sector and will be backed up with examples drawn from various project implementation.

Monitoring can be defined as the routine collection and analysis of information on the progress of the project’s activities in relation to the original and how they have been managed. For example it tracks progress against set plans and checks compliance to establish standards. It also focusses on what is being done and how it is being done, it also include the view s of beneficiaries and stake holders.

Evaluation

Evaluation is not a silver bullet, but without it managers may not have sufficient evidence to understand potential reasons why a program is exceeding, meeting or falling short term of performance expectations. Therefore, evaluation can be looked as attempting to critically, systematically and objectively determine the added value of the project in meeting the stated objectives. Evaluation in most of the developmental programs have two primary purpose: accountability to stakeholders and learning to improve effectiveness.

Accountability is used in ensuring taxpayer money are used efficiently, measuring project effectiveness, transparently disclosing finding to all stakeholders and using evaluation findings to inform resource allocation.

Leaning includes systematically generating and sharing knowledge about how best to achieve development outcomes through well-designed and executed projects and using that knowledge to inform decisions.

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

Formative and summative assessment are terms commonly used in monitoring and evaluation programme, however, the two terms don’t mean the same. Formative evaluation is used to monitor students’ learning to provide ongoing feedback that can be used by instructors or teachers to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning while summative evaluation is used to evaluate students learning at the end of an instructional unit by comparing it against some standard or benchmark.

In the above definition, it is clear that formative and summative evaluation method are not meant to evaluate in the same way, the below points further explain the major difference between the two.

Formative evaluation method takes place during the learning process not just one time but several times while summative evaluation takes place at a complete other time. Not during the process, but after it. The evaluation takes place after a course or unit’s completion.

There are also big difference between the two methods in getting the right information of the students learning. For example in formative method one may try to figure out whether a students’ doing well or needs help by monitoring the process while when using summative method, one assign grades. The grades tells us whether the student achieved the learning goal or not.

To sum up below are the examples for both formative and summative evaluation method.

Formative evaluation method can be class room polls, exit tickets, early feedback and so on. But one can also make them more fun, for example:

1. In response to a question inquiry, students write down 3 different summaries. 10-15 words long, 30-50 words long and 75-100 words long.
2. One can also use the 3-2-1 countdown exercise, students can be given cards to write on, or they can respond orally. They have to respond to three separate statements: 3 things you didn’t know before, 2 things that surprised you about this topic and 1 thing you want to start doing with what you have learned.

The best examples of summative evaluation method are midterm exams, end of unit or chapter tests. Final project or paper, district benchmark and scores used for accountability for schools and students.

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

1. Identify the potential dangers of a one sided monitoring system.

In monitoring and evaluation, qualitative method is refers to non-numerical examination and interpretation of observations. This type of method employs data collection that are non-quantitative and aims towards exploration of social relations, and describes reality as experience by the participants. On the other hand, quantitative method lies on quantitative techniques using statistical programmes suitable for the decision-making in society. This techniques resolve around the notion of quantities in numerical form, for example use of numbers, symbols and other mathematical expressions. It is descriptive and provides hard data on the numbers of people exhibiting certain behaviors, attitudes.

The potential dangers of a one sided monitoring system is that when use one sided monitoring system for instance quantitative method it is likely to be difficult to confirm or interpret the results. For example in a participatory rural appraisal process a combined monitoring system (quantitative and qualitative methods) can be used that help to find out how stakeholders are benefiting from a project and this can involves methods ranging from transect walk to matrix ranking an focus group discussions. Likewise, a household survey or annual project review meeting would combine a series of interview, discussion and facilitation method. By using one sided monitoring system one might fail to obtain reliable information due to one sided method of data collection as compare to the use of combined monitoring system that involve both qualitative and quantitative methods.

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

The common quantitative method often employed by economist and staticians range from surveys, key informant interview, focus group discussion to case studies.

Baseline, mid-term and end of the project survey. A baseline survey is often part of a well-planned impact evaluation survey where data are collected at or before the start of a project. Mid-term surveys and end of the project surveys use a similar questionnaire administered at baseline so that data can be compared.

Key informant interview

Key informant interview is conducted with a person who can provide detailed information and opinion on a particular subject base on his or her knowledge of a particular issue. For example, this could be information on how project activities have influenced the use of water resources in the community when the key informant is a member of a water user’s association.

Focus group discussion.

A focus group discussion is facilitated discussion among 8-12 carefully selected participants. The idea is that group members discuss the topic among themselves with guidance from a facilitator. It is a method used to obtain in-depth qualitative information on perceptions and ideas from a group of people who have something in common. For example, they have a shared interest in the topic or are from similar backgrounds.

Case studies,

In-depth interviews, usually with an individual household in order to write a brief story about their experience with the project. They usually adopt a historical perspective to show the situation that the household was in before they joined the project.

5. a. Define Logical Framework

Logical framework can be define as a basic tools that shows the components of a project, highlighting its management activities and outcomes and most often used to monitor and evaluate the project

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

the components of logical framework define clearly the objectives by establishing linkage between a hierarchy set of objectives and shows how each set intimately contribute to the aim of the project. Below are the various components of logical framework.

Goal, the long term results that an intervention seeks to achieve, which may be contributed to by factors outside the intervention. For example, reduce death and illness related to water and sanitation related diseases in the targeted communities.

Outcomes, the primary results that an intervention seeks to achieve, most commonly in terms of the knowledge, attitudes or practices of the target group. For example, improved access to and use of sustainable sources of safe water in target community.

Outputs, the tangible products, goods and services and other immediate results that lead to the achievement of outcomes. For example, community water points constructed or rehabilitated.

Activities, the collection of task to be carried out in order to achieve the outputs.

Indicators, quantitative and qualitative criteria that provide a simple and reliable means to measure achievement or reflect changes connected to the goal.

Means of verification, describe how the information on the indicator will be collected it and how often.

Assumptions, external conditions necessary if the goal is contribute to the next level of intervention
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