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**MODULE 2**

**Q1. To what extent would a Program manager be challenged when determining which indicators to employ in Monitoring and evaluating a project? (10 Mrks).**

Determining indicators to employ in monitoring and evaluation for a project may not only be the work of a program manager (PM) parse. The exercise ought to be participatory, which in most cases these has been ignored and in many developmental projects it has been left to the program managers. This has made many program managers to find it challenging in a number of ways.

Data availability has been challenging in a way that some of the data are considered privileged information by others, for example government, partners and donors. This makes program managers (PM), to have no control over those needed information to be measured.

There are issues with the standard indicator, a clear example is with USAID –OFDA funded program. This particular donor normally have set and standard indicators that implementing agencies must always have to indicate in their M&E plan or frame work. This does not give room for any PM to decide what to have and not to include.

Sometime indicators are imposed from above, for example from regional team of even country team. Yet some of these members may not be having any techniques in M&E, and so a PM will have to accommodate.

The other challenges are in line with human resources and technical skills. The activity needs skill personnel and therefore PMs must have an understanding of the staffing.

In relation to the above, the demand for objective verification has led to the tendency to use general and purely quantitative indicators that measure numbers or percentage of something, because they are easy to work through. In most cases they are weak indicators because they merely communicate that something has happened but not whether what has happened is an important measure of objective. Therefore it should be known also that indicators that seems harder to verify may better capture the essence of the change taking place than the easily verified ones. Therefore according to UNDP 2009, a quantitative observation is no more inherently objective than a qualitative observation and indicator’s suitability depends on how it relates to the result it tends to describe.

In conclusion indicator determining must be a participatory process, with program manager taking the lead. Standardized sets of indictors must be communicated as requirement and internal system of the organization must be able to recognize that. The organization on the other hand must hire individuals who are technical with the required skill to manage the M&E department or sector. Both qualitative indicators and quantitative indicators must be considered where necessary depending on the intended results.

**Q2. Citing key characteristics of indicators, explain the fundamental differences between output and outcome indicators. (10 Mrks)**

Output indicators are used to monitor the number and types of activities carried out. Therefore it makes it more measurable with the available tools, a key characteristic of indicators.

They are mainly quantitative summary of an activity, it’s a confirmation that an activity has taken place, hence making it more reliable.

In general according to the UNDP 2009, output indicators measure both the process of producing the output (e.g. how many of something was done), as well as quality and or effect of what was produced (e.g. level of usage user satisfaction with what was produced).

While outcome indicators are not intended to only measure what an agency does or its contribution. They are indicators of change in development conditions and are therefore expected to be at a higher level than the indicators of the agency’s output (UNDP, 2009).

The outcome indicators assess progress against specified outcomes. They help verify that the intended positive change in the development situation has actually taken place.

In addition effective outcome indicators typically combine quantitative and qualitative measures, describing number of people benefiting from project and the nature of those benefits.

**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.**

**Project Outline**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Summary of objectives** | **Indicators** | **Means of Verifcation** | **Assumptions** |
| **Project Overall Goal/ objective** | To conduct mass measles campaign targeting all children under the age of 5 |  |  | Minimal security, staff are available and employment policies enable staff to settle on time. |
| **Impact** | Measles Mobidity and mortality reduction contributing to attaining MDG4 | Percentage of children death prevented as result of the campaign. | final evaluations; project accomplishment report |  |
|  | Percentage of measles immunization coverage, for children under the age of 5. | Baseline, midline, final evaluations; project accomplishment report |
| **Outcome** | Access to health care is expected to improve with the setting up of the maternal care centres and actual immunization. | Percentage of maternal care centre accessible and providing services to the community. | Baseline, midline, final evaluations; project accomplishment report |  |
| Percentage of the children under the age of 5 immunized against measles. | Baseline, midline, final evaluations; project accomplishment report |  |
|  | Percentage increase in the number of women visiting the maternal care centres | Baseline, midline, final evaluations; project accomplishment report |  |
| **Output** | Support to reduce the cases of measles through immunization and creating community awareness. | Number of children under 5 receiving measles vaccines. | monthly reports |  |
| Number of awareness campaigns conducted to key local leaders. | monthly reports |  |
| number of IEC materials developed | Monthly, quarterly and annual report. |  |
| **Activities** |  |  |  |  |
| Setting up Maternal care Centre |  |  |  |
| Providing information to key opinion leaders on value of child immunization |  |  |  |
| Procurement of cold chain boxes |  |  |  |
| Development of IEC materials for the public sensitization. |  |  |  |
| Actual Immunization of children |  |  |  |

**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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Outcome indicators** | **Process indicators** | **Activity description** | **Month 1** | **Month 2** | **Month 3** |
| To facilitate resettlement and re-integration of the returnees with their families. | -percentage of families/house settled into their original homes. | -Number of village elders, pastors opinion leaders trained on governance. | -Train 100 village elders, pastors, opinion leaders on governance, for three months. | 2000 | 1000 | 1000 |
| -number of individuals trained on human rights. | -Training of pastors, elders, village leaders and elders on human rights,( 100 beneficiaries). | 2200 | 2400 | 2000 |
| -number trained on land management laws. | -Train the leaders, elders and pastors on land laws and management.(100 beneficiaries) | 1650 | 2000 | 2300 |
|  |  | -number of family meetings conducted. | -conducting group family meetings at boma levels (3 sessions per month). | 1000 | 1000 | 650 |
| **Sub totals objective 1** |  |  |  | **6850** | **6400** | **5950** |
| To improve the production capacity and income of returnees through provision of agricultural inputs and non-agricultural activities | The percentage of households indicating an increase in production and productivity and income levels. | -number of farmers trained on improved farming techniques. | -Train households on improved farming techniques .(3000 beneficiaries) | 1000 | 1240 | 1000 |
| -number of youth trained on business techniques. | -Youth training on business and marketing techniques.( 10groups) | 3500 | 1500 | 1000 |
| -number of groups trained on business management | -training of groups on small grant management (10 groups) | 2300 | 1250 | 2400 |
| -Quantity of seeds distributed. | -Seeds, fertilizer and tools provision (3000 beneficiaries) | 6500 | - | - |
| -number of groups receiving small grants. | -Groups assessments on grants utilization and disbursement of grants.(10 groups) | 3000 | 3010 | 3100 |
| **Sub totals objective 2** |  |  |  | **16300** | **7000** | **7500** |
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