**MODULE 1 ASSIGNMENT: Rosemary Siwela**

**ASSIGNMENT**

1. **Difference between monitoring and evaluation**

Monitoring is an ongoing process of putting a project on check versus an evaluation that provides analyses as to whether the set objectives were achieved versus Evaluation which is an objective assessment of project relevance. Whilst in Monitoring there is more frequent keeping track of events and indicators the evaluation is conducted at the end of a project cycle thus providing overall project performance. Evaluation is time specific with the intention of determining whether the project has reached its goal and added proposed value.

Monitoring provides regular feedback on implementation so as to appreciate successes and challenges. Through monitoring learnings are derived and used to inform the need to adjust interventions and confirm relevance whereas evaluation would inform as to whether the project was conducted as planned. Through monitoring, short term progress of interventions is determined unlike evaluation which is done at the end of intervention thus providing impact or process effectiveness derived from implementation of such an intervention.

Given an example of HIV management in an organization, monitoring would include monthly tracking of number of prevention interventions implemented and uptake of HIV testing services at the HIV testing Centre whilst an evaluation would be conducted at the end of the year to determine from the HIV testing uptake what the incidence of HIV was or as an impact, to determine how many were entirely new testers.

Monitoring would provide information around efficiencies and evaluation provides effectiveness through outcome and impact i.e. in the example provided, the number of intervention implemented is an efficiency measure as it would be expected that at the planning phase there would be a plan of how many interventions to be implemented in a stipulated time. In comparison to evaluation the effectives of the intervention would be what value was derived by the organization i.e. one expectation of impact realized through testing uptake would be new individuals who now know their status and new HIV incidence. The tools used to gather data in both functions are similar except in evaluation where a more object survey can be conducted to provide objective feedback. The other differential between the two is that monitoring g is a function can is mostly conducted in house by project managers or implementers whereas evaluation though it can be done same way, is highly recommended to be conducted by external parties to minimize biasness.

There are some similarities in the tools in that may be used for both monitoring and evaluation. Together they provide performance measures that help in making informed decisions about project strategic planning and resources allocation.

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

Baseline survey is a survey or research that provides a preliminary view or status about a particular situation or indicator. It serves as the reference point for project impact as it provides the status before an intervention, which can be used for comparison post intervention. The importance of doing the baseline is that during evaluation it provides objective data of progress made. I.e. In the example of an objective of improving HIV testing uptake, if the baseline was 20% of a given population, it can be compared with the actual uptake post a particular intervention. Baseline survey gives a more accurate link of achievement of a higher level objectives.

Other than using baseline survey data for comparison, it provides the profile of circumstances at the time that it is conducted. This scenario allows a proper projection of resources and adequate planning in preparation for implementation based on the current status. Where the project may be having several objectives, given the situation ascribed by the baseline survey, it enables decision of precedence of objectives for the particular project. A typical example would be where the baseline data shows that whilst there is a lower HIV testing uptake females are more likely to test than male counterparts. This information may be used to prioritize such that more efforts are dedicated in a focused campaign to get men to access testing.

Since indicators are obtained as a baseline it enables realistic targets to be adjusted from what may have been ambitious unattainable targets. With the objective of trying to attain the UNAIDS target of 90,90,90 in a community in a 2 year period, if the baseline of the first 90, is at 32% the project officer may decide to reduce the target to a lower attainable, realistic target below 90%.

Baseline data offers a direct comparison of scenarios in a project prior to and post implementation.

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

A summative summary is a more general type of evaluation which would be conducted at the end of a project to determine how well the objectives of that project were met. The typical example of this is that which is used at educational institutions to establish competence of the students. The negative aspect of this kind of evaluation is that since it is conducted at the end of the project, it doesn’t make provision for adjustments even where difficulties are depicted. An example of summative evaluation is that of officers trained for HIV testing at an institution, at the end of training there would be a need to evaluate knowledge and skills of counselling as compared to those were not trained. Summative is then focused on project impacts, addressing issues of sustainability of the project under question.

An example of the type of Summative evaluation is that where clients of most human services are asked to seek services, in addition to those of the program being evaluated, such as vocational training or support groups. Client time, client funds, and client transportation spent because of these referrals, and the resources consumed by the referred-to services when actually used, can be critical to include. Otherwise an evaluation might erroneously report substantial returns for minimal investments that actually required more resources. As said ‘when judging the value of a program in the context of constrained funding, outcomes are meaningless until they are compared to the types and amounts of resources consumed to produce them’ Anonymous

In contrast to formative evaluation, ‘’ the assessment of the effectiveness in implementing plans that guide activities to carry out a program’’ (Chyun, 2015) can be done at the beginning of the project to establish project feasibility and appropriateness. The former would give of indication of resources required as well. It is most useful when there is a new project or intervention to establish that identified need. With this type of evaluations it enables earlier modifications where projects have been identified so as to make adjustments in the overall project whilst summative wouldn’t create such opportunity as it done at the end of the project. Formative is more a qualitative assessment providing information of how well things were implemented thus acknowledging the outputs and outcomes produced.

The other distinguishing factors between the two type of evaluation, summative and formative is that formative is very much efficiency oriented meaning there’s more focus on the process of implementation versus the impact derived at the end. Formative evaluation would factor inputs such as timelines, appropriate personnel employed in the project and actual funds spent against planned expenditure. This evaluation is done periodically or at intervals of the project. This results from this comparison allows certain decisions to be made regarding what can be changed in order to improve the expected outcome. An examples of efficiency for a typical intervention, would be funds spent versus those allocated; budget variance. The other intriguing difference between the two is that formative evaluation is often done in-house by project officers or community involved in the project whereas summative is often done by external evaluators, although not mandatory.

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.**
2. **Identify the potential dangers of a one sided monitoring system**

There are two methods used for evaluation; qualitative and quantitative. It would be dangerous to continue to use one method over the other as the two methods provide information that complements one another. Qualitative information provide information regarding the impacts, and this would normally be difficult information to quantify using the quantitative methods. Quantitative monitoring seeks to establish changes in numerical value of a specific variable, in a formalized manner whilst qualitative monitoring methods are descriptive An example of the link between the two is that of a survey where quantifiable data would be obtained and qualitative method like an interviews conducted, on the same subject, would now assist in providing explanations on certain data obtained from the survey. This demonstrates how well the two are inseparable in most cases, if one method is used over the other the information obtained would be incomplete or limited.

A one sided monitoring system is dangerous as sited by Aldato, 2011 “quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods compensate for each other’s weaknesses, and each approach provides more value when used in a mixed method design” Following the former statement it is indeed true the two have to be equally utilized coz of their strengths and weaknesses. Quantitative methods though it’s easier to analyse it is not easily applied on a larger population, doesn’t provide context thus not providing insight regarding what’s under review. With quantitative methods the analysis is more complex but provides more context and further explanations to data already found through quantitative methods. This goes to show the methods complement one another to provide more value to the valuation.

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

There are different type of quantitative methods employed by economists and statisticians. The popularly used methodology is the questionnaire surveys. This method is commonly used as its more structured, easy to administer and draw objective non-biased evaluations from the results.

Survey are more structured in that the statistician or the economist can construct sentences in a manner that leads to the issues of interest in a specific subject matter. An example would be, if one is seeking to analyses sexual abuse issues, the choice of questions can be pre-determined to lead the respondent to the specific issues such as: frequencies that they have experienced it, areas where it mostly happens i.e. work or home, any questions of experiences post the alleged abuse. This guides the respondent versus a situation of an interview question structured similarly but may come with diverse forms of response, that are not necessarily within the context of interest. However, having structured options of responses may limit the feedback in that the responses are restricted to options provided.

Drawing conclusions from quantitative methods is also simpler from the analysis as it is ‘quantifiable’ thus numerically demonstrating weight between responses. Even though it is easy to draw conclusions, this methodology is tedious to employ. It may be difficult to reach out to the required number but on the other hand where there’s a huge populations to be reached it is faster to administer, as compared to interviews and focus groups.

Statistically quantitative methods provide better comparisons between similar surveys that may have been done, thus assisting in deriving more useful and objective feedback and conclusions. The validity and reliability of the quantitative methods have been affirmed to be higher than those of qualitative methods (Steller T. 2008)

1. **a. Define Logical Framework**

It is a systematic manner of determining logical reasoning between the cause and effect of situations involved in working towards a specific goal, for a specific project. This connects reasoning’ how and why’ in the form of a matrix (columns and rows), between the intended goal all the way to the actual activities that are required to attain that goal thus also leading to expected outcome and providing a visual matrix of the overall project.

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

A logical framework is made up of rows and columns

The columns in the matrix denote the level in hierarchy in the way the sequence that they will be achieved, usually four in number and the link in achievement of objective is from lower level to highest, and i.e. the lowest contributes the next up-line etc. until the final objective at the highest level is achieved. Due to this vertical relationship it is termed the vertical matrix (denoted by pink filling in the table below)

The rows of the matrix are termed horizontal matrix. These now demonstrate how the objectives set in the vertical line will be achieved, measured and verified and associated assumptions (denoted by yellow filling in the table below).

Components:

The Goal denotes what the project is set out to achieve

Purpose stipulates what the overall project is set out to achieve

The objective: What the goal intends to achieve, in how long and which population, and describes anticipated changes in how long.

**A table showing the Logic Model Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | indicator | verification | assumption |
| Goal |  |  |  |
| purpose |  |  |  |
| Objectives: To test 90% of employees by Dec 17 2018 | Percentage employees tested by Dec 2018 | Data for employees tested | There are no duplicated counts |

In the horizontal matrix there would be the indicator which is for a specific set objective how will the achievement or progress be determined, in actual value, by how much i.e. percentage employees tested

Verification: the source of information to validate the existing data

Assumptions: These are issues that may compound the data captured. There may be repeat cases to it may be assumed that all data captured there were no duplications.

In some instances in the horizontal matrix may be inputs, which denote all resources or things required in order for the objective to be realised. In the example given Inputs would be trained HIV testers, test kits, designated testing facility.
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