|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ONLINE LEARNING CENTRE**  **AFRICA CENTRE FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| **Surname** | Ngwenya | | | |
| **First Name/s** | Tshengisile Rythym | | | |
| **Student Number** | **ACPMPGD/ 095/2018** | | | |
| **Subject** | Post Graduate Diploma in Monitoring and Evaluation | | | |
| **Assignment Number** | Module 1 | | | |
| **Date Submitted** | 2019 /01/ 15 | | | |
| **Submission (√)** | First Submission |
| **Postal Address** | P O Box 1123 | | | |
| Harding | | | |
| KwaZulu Natal | | | |
| South Africa | | | |
|  | | | 4680 |
| **E-Mail** | [tshengie84@gmail.com](mailto:tshengie84@gmail.com) | | | |
| **Contact Numbers** | (Work) 039 433 1955 | | | |
| (Home) | | | |
| (Cell) 0721130767 | | | |
| **Course/Intake** | JANUARY 2019 | | | |
| **Declaration:** I hereby declare that the assignment submitted is an original piece of work produced by myself. | | | | |
| **Signature: TR Ngwenya** | | | **Date: 2019/01/15** | |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS……………………………………………………………..3**

**QUESTION 1…………………………………………………………………………..….4**

**QUESTION 2………………………………………………………………………….......6**

**QUESTION 3……………………………………………………………………………....8**

**QUESTION 4 ……………………………………………………………………………..10**

**QUESTION 5……………………………………………………………………. ………..12**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY……………………………………………………………………...….14**

**List of Abbreviations**

UNDP- United Nations Development Programme
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M&E- Monitoring and Evaluation

RBM-Results Based Management

**Question 1**

**Explain in about 350 words why M&E informs good programming practice**

With the introduction of Results Based Management (RBM), monitoring and evaluation has evolved from process monitoring and evaluation to outcome monitoring and evaluation. The former used to monitor input, activity and outputs and latter being more result focussed, monitoring the entire results chain as one moves from baseline to attainment outcomes. With clear stated results, monitoring and evaluation provides a clear thread that maps progress from baseline through to achievement of the desired outcomes (UNDP, 2002: 1-19).

Monitoring and evaluation supports planning and implementation. It supports the development of a focussed work plan, with Impact, Outcomes, Benchmarks / indicators that show progress, activities, Budgets and timeframes. Good communication of the work plan, monitoring and evaluation reports maintains transparency and build support among the various team players, enabling members to position themselves strategically in order to contribute to attainment of outcomes (SAMDI, 2007: 18).

Through monitoring, one is able to continually assess and measure the performance of projects. Reports generated from monitoring give direction on whether the program is on tract, delayed, in progress or has accomplished its objectives. Monitoring offers an opportunity to identify early if the activities are progressing towards the desired outcomes. This allows for strategic refocussing and fine-tuning before it’s too late, offering the program a greater chance of success (UNDP, 2002: 1-19).

Evaluation being and analytical activity is able to identify bottlenecks and barriers and assist to find their root causes. Feedback and recommendations contained in evaluation reports allows one to extract lessons that can be used to improve current program performance or used for future program planning. This is an important source of evidence that can inform decision making and improve accountability (UNDP, 2002: 1-19). Results from process evaluation can elicit the need for added support in terms of resources and facilitate the formation of stronger coalition/collaboration with supporting partners. Results from outcome evaluation can inform policy changes or strategic changes at a more central sphere of management (SAMDI, 2007: 18).

Monitoring and evaluation supports program effectiveness and efficiency by tracking that resources are used fully and optimally in order to achieve objectives. The program remains grounded and maintains focus on project beneficiaries to ensures optimum benefit, acceptability and utilization of services. The evaluator can latter assess sustainability and impact of the project (UNDP, 2002: 1-19).

**Question 2**

**Describe the fundamental similarities and differences between Monitoring and Evaluation**

The table below summarises the differences between monitoring and evaluation as described by the South African Management Development Institute (2007:13-14):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Monitoring | Evaluation |
| Objective | Keeps track of implementation process, activities, outputs and indicators. | Analysis of information in order to gauge the effectiveness, efficiency in achieving stated goals/objectives , sustainability of outcomes and the impact of the project. |
| Focus | Identifying changes over a period of time in line with predetermined plan/goals. Ensures that resources are used optimally. The focus is on efficiency. | Gauges the success of the project in meeting its objectives. The focus is effectiveness of strategy, Strengths , weaknesses, Opportunities and threats of project design, implementation and results. |
| Conduct | It is conducted by implementers /internally at operational level | It is conducted by external evaluators/partners/internal /implementers |
| Term | Short term and ongoing during project implementation | Long term and periodic at predetermined intervals during the life of the project and sometimes after the project has been completed (Impact evaluation). |
| Use | Provides an early alert of challenges/bottlenecks in performance and for corrective actions to be instituted early . | Alerts on policy/ strategy or design challenges. Offers an opportunity to learn, refine strategies and a reference for future projects. |
| Consideration | Does not take Into consideration past experiences and only monitors the current project from baseline | Take into consideration past experiences |
| Process | Includes regular meeting, monthly and quarterly reviews, regular reports and updates to management, project staff and donors about actual performance against the expected. | Involves additional data collection exercises , reports with recommendations presented to all stakeholders. |
| Related to | Observation. | Judgement/ Decision making |
| “Answers the question” | “What is going on?” | “Why do we have the results that are indicated by the monitoring data” |

Similarities between monitoring and evaluation.

* Both are methods of analysis in order to gauge progress in relation to goals
* Can give constructive suggestions with regards to project schedule, budget and logistics.
* Encourages accountability

**Question3**

**Describe the difference between the formative and summative evaluation process and explain the time of each process in the life of a project [10]**

The South African Management and Develop institute (2007:74-75) highlights the following differences between formative and summative evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria for comparison | Formative Evaluation | Summative evaluation |
| Term | In the early stages of the project/intervention. | Later in the life of the project or after project completion. |
| Focus | Evaluates how efficient the project operates and develops. It looks at strength and weakness of the way services are delivered. It focuses on outputs, activities and whether the project is implemented according to plan. | The evaluation focusses on the effectiveness, and sustainability of outcome and impact of the project. |
| Purpose | To check for efficiency in implementation and to inform changes in the structure and document reasons for changes. | How the outcome and impact compare with the original project goals. It seeks to address what difference the project made. |
| Data collection | Data collected during planning and implementation of the program | Data collection is carried out towards the end of the project or after it has been completed |
| Use | Increases the chances of success by discovering what works and what doesn’t | Can determine if the project can be expanded and if it should receive continued support and funding |
| Measurement instrument | It usually involves qualitative measurement instruments such as interviews, focused groups, observations and surveys. | It uses quantitative measurement instrument such as percentages, surveys etc. |
| Evaluators | Staff working with the project is usually involved but may involve external stakeholders | Evaluation is conducted by external stakeholders |
| Answers the question | How is the intervention implemented? | What changes has the intervention effected |

**Question 4**

**With brief explanations, outline the key questions both formative and summative evaluations seek to answer [10].**

4.1 Formative evaluation

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2017: 26-27). the following key questions are addressed by a formative evaluation:

To address If the program is being implemented according to plan or schedule. The following questions will be addressed;

* Has the program been implemented as planned, if not, why?
* Are the changes to the original plan justified?
* Is the project implementation in line with the planned timeline/schedule?
* To what extent are the projects actual costs in line with budget allocation, what caused the deviation? Is the deviation justified?

To Assesses if efforts are producing the intended outputs:

* What has worked or not worked and why?
* Are activities carried out by appropriate personnel/
* To what extent is the project moving towards achieving stated goals.
* Which strategies are more effective in producing outcomes and which ones are less effective and why?
* What has been the barriers and how are they dealt with?
* How are project beneficiaries accessing services or involved in decision making?

To Identifies strengths and weaknesses of the effort.

* What needs to be improved and how?
* What are the strengths and weaknesses of the project and how are they utilized/overcome?

To inform adjustments to the effort

Is the project performance justified and how can overall delivery be improved?

At the current pace, What is the likelihood that the project will produce the desired outcomes? Where can improvement be instituted and does the strategy need revision?

4.2 Summative evaluation

To assess if the program achieved its desired outcomes.

* To what extent did the project meet its overall goals and objectives?
* What impact did the project have on the project beneficiaries?
* Did the project have any unintended impacts and if so to what extent?

To assess what made the project effective or ineffective

* Which parts of the project were most effective in achieving outcomes?
* Was the project equally effective for all beneficiaries?
* Was there a shortfall in achieving the objectives? what caused them and what was the extent of the shortfall?

To assess if the effort is sustainable and replicable

* Is the project replicable?
* Is the project sustainable?

**Question 5**

**Explain the main limitations of the pretest –posttest model of evaluation.**

Robson, Shannon, Goldenhar and Hale, (2001:18-28) states that a pretest –posttest design is a non-experimental design of evaluation. It is not useful in evaluating long term projects. Besides the project/intervention, there can be other environmental incidents and or circumstances that can contribute to the outcome (biases). These can obscure the effects of an intervention i.e. threaten internal validity. The following are factors that an evaluator needs to be careful of and account for when conducting a pretest-posttest evaluation:

* History: An event other the intervention occurring during or after the intervention influences the outcome. An example is an intervention of a series of educational programs on safe sex conducted on pupils who are also offered life orientation skills lesson at school as part of the academic syllabus. The lesson covers safe sexual practices. During the evaluation, it may be difficult to conclude that results observed are purely due to the intervention alone. The longer the period of the intervention the higher are the chances that other influential factors can creep in and affects the results. When doing a pretest –posttest design, it is important to identify other factors in the environment that could have an effect on the outcome and quantify their effect.
* Instrumentation/Reporting: Internal validity is affected when the method of measuring outcomes or the measurement instrument changes before, over the course or after the intervention. Faulty measurements also affect internal validity. To avoid instrumentation and reporting threats, same methodology of measurement must be used.
* Testing threat: Occurs when a before measurement can have an effect on the outcome. Instrument used could create an awareness of the outcome before the intervention is introduced. As part of the evaluation, one should acknowledge that taking a test could have its own effect.
* Placebo: The non-intervention group could display improvement in outcome beyond that which may be expected in the intervention group because of psychological mechanisms that makes the placebo group to believe that the intervention Is working. When evaluating, it’s important to identify and acknowledge possible placebo effect.
* Hawthorne: The involvement of outsiders e.g. researchers could have an effect on the outcome which independent of the key intervention. The intervention group may perform better /beyond expectation under test conditions solely because of the awareness that they are being observed and tested. When conducting measurements, one must try and find ways to minimise the Hawthorne effect.
* Maturation: Over time, the intervention group can naturally develop in ways that can affect the outcome. This development is independent of the intervention. e.g. the intervention group can over time be sicker at work more often than a comparable group. This can naturally be as a result that the intervention group now has older employees that the comparative group and not because the working environment is detrimental to health. When conducting an evaluation, one should try and identify any natural changes in study population that can shadow the effect of the intervention. These can be corrected by statistical models.
* Drop out: when a lot of people drop out from the intervention group, the characteristics of the intervention group changes and this can have an effect on outcome. When evaluating, one has to acknowledge the participant drop out in the analysis.
* Regression to the mean threat: the successful outcomes achieved in a group with extreme measurements are not due to the intervention itself but rather to a natural tendency to move towards normal. When choosing study participants, one should avoid using groups with extreme incidents as the intervention group.
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