

Report on

Training on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) for Tearfund Partners

July 25 – 29, 2011

Nairobi, Kenya

Conducted by

ELD Training

www.eldtraining.com



Introduction.....	3
Summary and Course Evaluation.....	3
Daily Narrative	4
Day One.....	4
Day Two.....	5
Day Three.....	6
Day Four.....	7
Day Five.....	8
Annex 1: List of Participants.....	9
Annex 2: Course Outline.....	10



Introduction

This report documents the process and evaluates the outcomes of a five-day training on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) conducted for Tearfund partners at Nairobi, Kenya, July 2011. The training was developed at the request of Ms. Mbaraka Fazal, Capacity Building Coordinator, Tearfund Kenya.

The objectives of the training were to:

- Develop participants' understanding on Project Cycle Management (PCM)
- Broaden participants' understanding on M&E
- Develop their skills in designing a project-based M&E framework
- Enable participants to develop plans to apply the skills acquired

Mr. Uttam Uprety, ELD Training Manager, led the course. Altogether, there were twenty participants. A list of these can be found in Annex 1.

This report is based on responses of participants in daily feedback sessions, final training evaluation results as well as trainer's observations.

Summary and Course Evaluation

The training was monitored on a daily basis, with participants reflecting at the end of each day and reviewing the content and process each following morning. The daily reviews were led by different participants on each day. Daily reflections and reviews indicated that participants were satisfied with the content, process and learning.

As the course progressed, they grasped the key concepts M&E, formerly something that had been intimidating for many. On the final day, participants completed a questionnaire and added their final comments on the training. All responses suggested that they had found the workshop a valuable and enjoyable experience.

From the trainer's perspective, the training was successful in:

- Demystifying M&E for participants
- Broadening their understanding on various aspects of M&E
- Developing their skills to apply M&E to their own working situation

By the end of the course participants were on the same wavelength in terms of conceptual clarity on various M&E terminologies. Furthermore, they had improved understanding on how Project Cycle Management can be simplified through the Logical Framework Approach (LFA). Similarly, they learned the aspects of Monitoring and Evaluation to be planned while defining the scope of the M&E framework.

<i>'What was the most helpful aspect of the workshop for you?'</i>
The Log Frame and M&E questions
Objectives tree, re-working of the log frame, M&E system
Results chain and objectives analysis / problem analysis
Designing the M&E framework
Developing the Log Frame
Differentiating between outputs and outcomes

Participants' confidence increased. From designing the Terms of Reference for case-based M&E to designing a complete M&E framework, frequent opportunities for practical work helped them build their self-reliance. Practical work using participants' own projects as cases helped them to see how the concepts of M&E could be incorporated easily into ongoing projects as well as those in the pipeline.

The facilitator tried to maintain a balance between theoretical as well as practical work. Similarly, he tried to bring in as many diverse cases as possible into the practical work.

Despite participants' high level of satisfaction, there were some concerns. The training was very intensive and covered a lot of ground, and it was suggested that two separate courses – one on Project Cycle Management and another on M&E – may have worked better. Due to the amount of ground covered, at times the amount of practical work was less than would be desirable, and energizers were less frequent than on less rigorous courses.

Even so, participants were enthusiastic and involved themselves fully throughout. They found the concepts and tools useful and relevant. Logistics were well managed.

Daily Narrative

Day One

Mbaraka Fazal, Tearfund Kenya Capacity Building Officer, led the introduction session with an icebreaker. Following this, she led a discussion to help participants to develop ground rules and responsibilities for the course duration. Next, participants were asked to note down and post their fears and expectations to the wall.



The next session saw a reflection on M&E experiences. While reflecting on their experiences with regard to M&E, participants also presented their project Log Frames and indicators and elaborate on how they were applying M&E in their respective projects. This was followed by a discussion where participants shared the problems they faced during M&E.

Next, the trainer led a plenary discussion on key concepts of PCM and then presented the concepts in detail. Key points from the session included:

- A project is a means to achieve desired future situation
- By designing a project, we are designing the future
- Every project has its own objective, specific time frame, specific target group / beneficiaries, resource limitations and unique location
- Every project has several stages regardless of its nature, amount of funding or scope
- Project Cycle Management is a process where we use the lessons learned to improve the next stage or other projects

<i>Problems Faced when Applying M&E</i>
Reconciling the agendas of donors and community
Getting the right information at the right time
Getting support from partners in information collection
Donors' varying formats and terminologies
Unfamiliar with the terms and concepts of M&E
Getting information and documenting what happened
Poor quality of information collected by community groups and junior officers
Some schools and community groups not receptive to the M&E
M&E is a mystery
Expectations from the community

While elaborating on the Logical Framework Approach as a tool for PCM, the trainer explained how the Log Frame is sensitive to the external environment. The Log Frame has two types of logic – the vertical logic, which describes the project cause and effect – and the diagonal logic, which is tied to external factors. The session also clarified much of the most commonly used terminology.

Day Two

After devotion and a review of the previous day's learning, the trainer highlighted the key steps of project design through LFA that includes:

1. Preparatory phase
 - a. Identify the issue
 - b. Identify the stakeholders
2. Analysis
 - a. Stakeholders
 - b. Problems
 - c. Objectives
 - d. Strategy
3. Planning
 - a. Selecting approaches
 - b. Intervention logic
 - c. Assumptions
 - d. Indicators and Means of Verification (MOV)
4. Implementation Planning
 - a. Means and Cost
 - b. Scheduling
 - c. Responsibilities / Management

While describing the steps the trainer explained the tools for stakeholder analysis, and took participants through a problem analysis exercise followed by a presentation on setting objectives and strategy analysis.

The next session was on the Results Chain. The trainer explained the concept, clarified the differences between different types of result and explained how various organisations' terminologies differ. He then presented a case study of two projects and participants worked in groups to develop their Results Chain.

The post-lunch session focused on Monitoring and Evaluation. In plenary, participants discussed the definition of M&E and the differences between the two concepts. Then the trainer highlighted how Monitoring and Evaluation were different in four aspects:

- Objective
- Focus
- Frequency
- Scope

Following the discussion, participants first brainstormed the key concepts similar to M&E and had small group discussion on these. The concepts discussed were:

- Monitoring, Review and Assessment
- Assessment, Supervision and Evaluation
- Supervision, Evaluation and Inspection
- Public / Social Audit

The day was summarised with a reflection exercise where three groups were asked to share one thing they have learnt in day two and how they planned to apply it.

Day Three

While reviewing the day two participants were paired to discuss two questions. The questions were as follows:

- What have you learnt since Day One of the course?
- What topic do you feel needs more time?

The first issue of the day was Aspects of M&E. The trainer first presented a project cycle and recapped how this is developed. He then highlighted how various aspects of Monitoring and Evaluation relate to specific stages of Project Cycle Management. The aspects discussed included:

- Input monitoring, process monitoring, output monitoring
- Relevancy, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability

Participants were given a task to brainstorm questions to be addressed to check for each aspect of Monitoring and Evaluation. Group work was presented in plenary and the trainer concluded by presenting the key questions to be answered when assessing each aspect of evaluation.

The post-lunch session saw a discussion on how to develop Terms of Reference for M&E. Three groups of participants were given a unique context and asked to define the key points to be included in the TOR. Their presentations were followed by discussion and input from the trainer. The six key aspects to be considered while planning for M&E as discussed in the session were:

1. The aim of the exercise
2. Who is it for?
3. Objectives and key questions for the exercise
4. Information collection and analysis
5. Ways of presenting the results
6. Organisation

What have you learned since Day One of the course?
As a project person, its good do get involved, be in touch, be able to communicate what is happening and evaluate the progress
Everybody is a manager and people need to be allowed to exercise authority and decision making at their work
Alternative analysis and how practical it can be with the Tearfund partners
I even did not know that Log Frame means Logical Framework but now I even know how to construct one and use it in my work
How to use the Log Frame to monitor and evaluate the project progress
Problem and Objective tree
The whole concept of M&E and the simplicity of the Log Frame
The PCM concept
Developing risks and assumptions for the project Log Frame
Distinguishing outputs and outcomes
Have so much information that is not documented but now is going to document
The project is a cycle and even after phase out, it is important to go back and learn from it for future sake
Selection of indicators wisely – the ones which can be used effectively monitor the project
The different terminologies used in PCM and M&E
What topics do you feel need more time?
The Results Chain flow
Diagonal Logic
More insight in problem tree analysis
Objectives analysis
Different documents needed in the PCM process
Alternatives analysis

The final issue discussed on Day Three was Designing Indicators. The trainer started the discussion with a presentation of some codes for group reflection clarified for participants how indicators are to be developed so that everyone understands it the same way and are sensible enough to measure the changes. The dimensions of a good indicator as discussed in the session were:

- Time
- Quantity
- Quality
- Target group
- Location

After sharing an example of an indicator with all of these five dimensions defined, participants designed indicators based for their own projects. The day was reviewed before closing and participants shared what they had learned in the day.

Day Four

The day began with teams developing Results Chains and Indicators as a first step to developing their M&E frameworks. (Those who had already completed their Log Frames reviewed these.) During this session, which continued throughout the morning, the trainer coached and gave feedback to teams on their work.

By the end of the exercise participants' confidence had increased in this area. Reflecting on the process and their achievements, they unanimously said that their earlier projects earlier had lacked logic and, as a result, their indicators were not enough to measure the project outputs and objectives.

The session concluded with the trainer highlighting types of indicators related to three core aspects:

- Equity
 - Indicators of accessibility
 - Indicators of relevance
 - Indicators of equity
 - Indicators of process
- Sustainability
 - Indicators of quality
 - Indicators of impact
 - Indicators of sustainability and maintenance
- Productivity
 - Indicators Availability
 - Indicators Coverage
 - Indicators Utilization
 - Indicators Effort – the beneficiaries' ability to take extra improved action than just what they have been asked to do
 - Indicators Efficiency

The post-lunch session was designing an M&E system. The trainer presented how the Log Frame can be a basis for both M&E systems as well as detailed operational plans. He further explained what constitutes an M&E system, illustrating with two case studies which highlighted monitoring guidelines and the M&E framework at both project and organizational levels.

While presenting, the following steps in designing an M&E system were clarified:

1. Decide on the scope of Monitoring
2. Develop monitoring plan and mechanism
3. Implement monitoring
4. Reporting and feedback

<i>Things to consider while developing an M&E framework</i>
Aspects of M&E
Key questions to be addressed
Indicators
MOV
Frequency
Responsibility

Groups then developed M&E frameworks for the projects they had been developing that morning. As they progressed, they received coaching and inputs from the trainer, and it was agreed to present the frameworks next day.

Day Five

The day began with review and Q&A. In response to participants' request, the trainer then recapped on some of the areas covered over the first four days. He recapped on the Results Chain and how M&E is connected to this at all levels; and explained about the problem tree and how to use it to develop outputs, design a strategy and scope the project.

Next, groups presented their M&E frameworks from the previous day. This was followed by group discussion and the resource person's feedback.

The trainer then explained various tools for M&E. Tools presented were:

- Interview
- Field visits
- Key informants survey
- Focus Group Discussion
- Participatory self-monitoring
- Case study
- Surveys / Studies
- Spot-check visits

Then he introduced a structured tool for group discussion: ORID. Participants got the chance to see how the logic and flow of ORID (Objective – Reflective – Interpretive – Decisional) questions help to lead a discussion. They realised that the decisional questions of any discussion should be close to the rational aim of the discussion to make the discussion fruitful.

Key learning for participants from the session was:

- Discussion, unless facilitated well, can end in chaos
- A good discussion is characterised with time management, sustained motivation, focused discussion and good opportunities for information sharing
- A facilitator has to focus on rational and experiential aims equally
- A facilitator can use a logical or 'life thinking' process to make people comfortable in participating in a discussion

The final session of the course was on developing action plans. Teams, each representing a partner organization, prepared action plans to incorporate their learning from the training into their working areas / projects. Each team submitted their plan to Tearfund to ensure proper follow up.

Finally, the trainer took participants through a review of the entire course. Course evaluation forms were completed by participants, after which Ms. Gladys Wathanga, Tearfund Kenya Country Director, and Uttam Uprety, ELD Training Manager, awarded certificates to the participants. Participants also received resource CDs containing slides, photos and supplementary materials. Ms. Gladys Wathanga closed the course with final remarks.

Annex 1: List of Participants

Organization	Name	Position	Contact
ELD Training	Uttam Uprety	Training Manager	uttam.uprety2010@gmail.com
Tearfund	Gladys Wathanga	Country Representative	gladys.wathanga@tearfund.org
	Mbaraka Fazal	Capacity Building Coordinator	mbaraka.fazal@tearfund.org
	Liz Karimi	Administration Assistant	elizabeth.karimi@tearfund.org
St. John's Community Centre	Peres Macharia	Programme Officer	perismacharia@yahoo.com
	Michael Ndegwa	Project Officer	mikekndegwa@gmail.com
ICFEM	Irene Masika	Agriculture Coordinator	irenewanjala@yahoo.com
	Macdon Namungu	Evangelism Coordinator	macdonjuma@yahoo.com
LISP	Beatrice Muthusi	Programme Officer	bsirich@yahoo.com
	Anne Gachanja	Programme Officer	0722699667
CCS Mt. Kenya	Fedis Nyaga	Programme Coordinator	fedisnyagah@yahoo.com
ACK Pwani CCS	Elizabeth Rigah	Head of Finance	accounts@ackpwaniccs.or.ke
	Eliakim Mwarigha	Extension Officer	mzmwarigha@yahoo.com
	John Mangenge	Director	director@ackpwaniccs.or.ke
AIC Korr – Tirim	Lynne Swanepoel	Missionary	nick.swanepoel@aimint.net
	Joshua Turuga	Pastor	joshuaturuga@gmail.com
	Joshua Lengewa	Teacher	lengewa@yahoo.com
	Matthew Erot	Vet Office/ Evangelist	0710888480
ACK Diocese of Kericho	Samuel Ole Naikumi	Priest	naikumirev@yahoo.com
Carlile CUM	Nancy Njagi	Programme Coordinator	nancy.njagi@carlilecollege.org
	Monicah Njeri	Field Officer	moniehgrace@yahoo.com

Annex 2: Course Outline

