

# M & E News Summary Sheet June 2008

## Particular Subject Areas

### The discussion on Output, Outcome etc continues...

The score of pre and post test, result show that 80% increase knowledge. Is it Output or Outcome? If you have any guidelines/ web, please advice.

**Kun Heng hengkunkh@yahoo.com**

I think it is output since output refer to change in knowledge or improvement of information. The outcome of this variable will be the application of knowledge gained from the output

**Khan Dawood dawood\_laf@yahoo.com**

I beg to differ (hopefully without getting into a semantic argument). I consider the terms, "output" and "deliverable" to be synonyms. They are goods and services that are to be delivered.

If you can get students to obey you, you can make them stay in a classroom for an hour (the output is the lesson delivered to the students). But you can't necessarily make them learn, which is an outcome.

In my opinion, this is the fallacy of some American educational accountability models - especially extreme ones, where remuneration is cut or you suffer other high stakes consequences if your students fail to show improved test scores (usually in reading and math). We are all working together to try to learn, and hopefully solve our problems together. But nobody should be punished when that doesn't happen for one reason or another.

On the other hand, if I am the school principal, I do have the right to insist that the students enter the classroom and the teacher present his or her lesson. If that doesn't happen, and no explanation or justification is offered, I have the right and duty to see to it that consequences follow.

**Robert K. Walker bobkwalker@gmail.com**

Please note that I didn't say that we should not pay attention to everything that goes on in a program/intervention/project, from input, to process, then output and outcome.

I only said it's a waste of energy to spend too much time working out definitions of the terms you think should be used.

I also said that the important part is to do the evaluation, and to do it well. If using specific terms helps with that, then fine. If we spend too much time arguing about what the terms mean, then that interferes with getting an evaluation done.

**Gene gsocialchange@yahoo.com**

I affirm Khan's explanation. Yes, it is output because it is the immediate result of the training, the outcomes would be how the participants apply the knowledge and skills learned from the training. Outcomes is the actual manifestation and application of the outputs.

**Aydel Salvadora aydel\_s@yahoo.com**

Discussions about which level of logic to assign to stages of social change are common when we lose site of the human faces involved.

We can overcome the arbitrary and abstract language of the logframe by bringing the key classes of human actor back to the forefront. The language of the logframe can be used to simply describe the role or experience of the chain of human actors within the overall social change process:

- The *Implementing Team* is responsible for the deliverables (Outputs) of the project...e.g. facilitating training sessions
- We anticipate that *Direct Beneficiaries* (e.g. trainees) will experience changes in knowledge/attitude/ practice (Outcomes)
- These Direct Beneficiaries are normally expected to foster changes among a wider constituency (*Ultimate Beneficiaries*)...Impact

The chain of human actors is explicit. The assignment of the logic is self-evident.

**Paul Crawford pcrawford@aid-it.com**

In a good M&E report knowledge/attitude/practice do not fall in one category of "Outcome" all together unlike Paul has suggested in his previous email.

Because a training program can impart knowledge - create awareness but that knowledge has to be transformed into attitude change and the changed attitude must contribute to behavioural change (practice) for an outcome to be realised.

However, M&E is an evolutionary process, wherein M&E specialists from all over the world have to agree among themselves to further categorise "Outcome" into three sub categories "Lower level outcome - close to outputs"; "middle level outcome - intermediary as such"; and "Higher level outcomes - close to Impact".

In that case, this is just my hypothesis, "Knowledge" could be counted as a lower level outcome which is just closer to the outputs; "Attitude" could be middle level outcome - intermediary; and "Practice" could be counted as higher level outcome.

**Am Singh Bandari amsinghb@yahoo.co.uk**

### Call for Papers

I am writing you on behalf of the UK Evaluation Society Conference Committee. This year the UKES Annual conference will be hosted in Bristol, at the Marriott Royal Hotel, on 23-24 October.

The call for papers has been extended to 9th July and this year research students are invited to submit their papers. If you wish to submit your abstract, please click on the following link:

<http://www.profbriefings.co.uk/ukes2008/ukes08callforpapers.htm>

More information on the conference are available here:

<http://www.profbriefings.co.uk/ukes2008/>

**Monika Mura mn\_k@yahoo.com**

## Particular Subject Areas continued

I am going to conduct M&E training as a part of capacity building for partners. The training will be divided in to two rounds; basic and advanced. I am looking for the guidance for measuring the training and the capacity as well. In my opinion so far, I will use pre-post test for training evaluation. I would appreciate if you can share the ideas, resources, instruments or anything related. Also any good instrument on pre-post test on M&E training?

**Riza rintjong@yahoo.com**

In different sectors of industry and technical vocational institutes, centres and schools, due attention is given to the performance of the employees and trainees (students) by applying both Competency Based Technical and Vocational Education and Training TVET as well as Competency Based Employees Assessment and Assurance Quality Management System. These systems are applied by the management of different sectors of industry and technical vocational institutes, centres and schools with a view to have reasonable assurance of meeting their business objectives by assuring that their employees and trainees (students) are well trained, assessed and competent.

It is essential for the effective implementation and successful maintenance of individuals performance assessment and verification system (Competency Assurance Management System CAMS) for different industrial organizations that it is driven 'top down' organizationally, i.e. is mandated and supported by the industrial organisation's corporate management.

The corporate management of an industrial organization has to clearly state the mission of their Competency Assurance Management System (CAMS) and which is generally derived from the following mission statement:

The purpose of the Competency Based Employees Assessment and Assurance Quality Management System is to provide guidelines that will enable management to set valid and reliable controls in place to ensure employees and trainees are trained, assessed and competent and that they can discharge their responsibilities in a safe and effective manner.

The Competency Assurance Management System CAMS is applied to facilitate the development and implementation of technical and behavioral competence framework of minimum levels (standards) for the industrial organization's developpees. Such Development Framework DFW will ensure that all fresh graduated employees are developed to perform all tasks including HSE (Health, Safety and Environmental) and business critical tasks effectively to the level (standard) required at work place.

In order to support the above mission objective, a corresponding Corporate Level (Standard) Policy has to be established to ensure its realization. This policy, in general, stipulates the following:

- A. All work is performed by persons who are competent
- B. All job progression is based on demonstrated competence and performance. Progression will not be based on time and / or location

C. A framework of assessment and verification procedures based on "Minimum Assessment & Verification Standard Processes" is developed. The staff is assessed against agreed minimum competence levels (standards) for the specific job and a system is placed by to verify the assessment

D. Professionals are developed to a high level of competence in their chosen areas and their levels (standards) are maintained through life-long learning.

E. All business critical activities are performed by persons who can discharge their responsibilities effectively to meet business objectives of the industrial organization

F. All HSE (Health, Safety and Environmental) critical activities are performed by persons who can discharge their responsibilities effectively with due regard to HSE as laid down in the industrial organization's Policy

G. All contractors, vendors or service companies are contractually required to demonstrate adherence to the above principles

In addition to the above and as a policy for most of the industrial organisations, all job progression are generally based on demonstrated competence and performance. Progression is not based on time and / or location.

**Eng. Moustafa Wahba mmwahba2002@yahoo.co.uk**

### Baseline

We have developed our own LFA but still we are lacking in the Base Line for the same. Is there any other way we can measure/evaluate without Base Line. I need guidance.

**Ashwani Kumar ashwanikumar10@yahoo.com**

You can measure the status of each indicator before and after the project by using qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. For instance, for a food security project that already started implementation in 2007 you can ask questions like 'what was the % of HHs that could afford food three times a day, nutritional status, average HH income etc before and after 2007. But this approach may have its own drawbacks in terms of data quality since people are telling the data from their memory.

**Haile Teye hailat2003@yahoo.com**

If you're interested in "evaluation without indicators" methods you might have a look on this case study from Vietnam (follow the link): Assessing Impact without Indicators, Case Study from Vietnam [http://www.ideas-int.org/Documents/Demetrio\\_Innocenti.doc](http://www.ideas-int.org/Documents/Demetrio_Innocenti.doc)

**Demetrio Innocenti demetrioinnocentie@gmail.com**

## Particular Subject Areas continued

Baseline continued ...

While I agree with Haile, I have always been somewhat sceptical of 'reconstructed baseline' studies, especially where you have to rely heavily on people's perceptions of the way things were'.

If there is good documentary evidence of pre-existing practices, then it is possible to use this to strengthen a reconstructed baseline that draws on recollections. Perceptions.

It also depends on what your project is focusing on, but there may be good secondary data available on your core indicators (socio-economic status, Access to services etc). Where this kind of data is available it can be used to create a credible assessment of the position prior to the intervention. If your Project has not been operating long enough for realistic change to have taken place, you could always conduct the baseline assessment very early in the implementation phase. Although not perfect, this can give an indication of the pre-Project state of the beneficiary group (and I know that this is a contentious term).

**Jennifer**

As Jennifer and Haile have pointed out, the use of reconstructed baselines negates the core principle of baselines. A baseline is a characterisation of 'AS IS' conditions NOT AS WAS. Basing evaluations on data that were collected on the AS WAS basis will surely interfere with the quantification of the changes. Dependency on memory brings in another factor, that is, strength of memory. The net impact at the end of the study may be under or even overestimated because of this factor.

I know that it's quite difficult for you to reconstruct the correct data as it was before the implementation of the study but, if possible, you may combine the 'AS WAS' basis data from secondary sources to form an approximation of baseline. In statistics, it is believed that no statistical method can correct poorly collected data and no superbly collected data can correct a wrong statistical method. In essence, planning for a study or project is paramount because the quality of every stage depends on its predecessor stages.

**Frehd Cheptoris cheptoris2002@yahoo.com**

I also think that depending on perception and memory particularly in a project that involves change is problematic because you will be reconstructing the baseline from the memories and perceptions that have changed. A person who has undergone change would have changed her/his perceptions and memory to a degree that will influence the outcome of the reconstructed baseline.

**Chom Bagu cbagu\_oti@yahoo.com**

## M&E on Gender Based Violence Project

Is anyone working on M&E in eliminate violence against women/ gender based violence? If so please share M&E plans, indicators and capacity building plans with me. Asela Kalegampitiya aselakalegampitiya@yahoo.ie

My colleagues in the BRIDGE gender and development team at the Institute of Development Studies (<http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/>) here in the UK have produced a number of resources which may be of use to you when looking at M&E on a gender based violence project. The Supporting Resources Collection within the BRIDGE Gender and Indicators Cutting Edge Pack (published 2007) recommends two resources specifically on measuring and monitoring gender based violence (see section 5.3 – page 15). The full report can be downloaded at [www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/IndicatorsSRCfinal.pdf](http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/IndicatorsSRCfinal.pdf) (print copies are also available if you visit the BRIDGE website for more details).

There are also a number of resources in BRIDGE's sister website Siyanda (<http://www.siyanda.org/>) which may also be worth looking at (key search terms would be 'evaluation OR monitoring AND gender based violence'). If you require any further information from the BRIDGE team you can email them direct at [bridge@ids.ac.uk](mailto:bridge@ids.ac.uk).

**Anna Downie a.downie@ids.ac.uk**

I am doing PhD on with the focus on the NGOs Engagement/ Influencing state/government policies from Sociological point of view .As I continue researching I keep wondering which is the best theory (Theoretical framework) to explain such an engagement by NGOs. Anybody with idea will be highly appreciated.

**Andrew Mushi amushi1@yahoo.com**

I did a paper recently about distance education related to advocacy, and referred to the two stage flow of communication. Originally, that theory was about mass media; now distance education is mostly internet based. So you educate the opinion leaders, who spread the word and pressure the government. The examples I used are from distance education projects by Ágere Cooperação em Advocacy, in Brasilia.

**Robert K. Walker bobwalker@gmail.com**

In addition to advocacy, I think Role Theory along with the Supra System Approach of the Systems Theory will be useful in understanding the government and non-government systems with specific roles to play and gradually induce change to the government policies without crossing the boundaries of each other as the NGOs have abreast of latest developmental know-hows while the governments have the strong bureaucratic networks.

Systems Theory has many dimensions, one of which I had applied during my Doctoral Research in the 90s.

**An Singh Bandari ansinghb@yahoo.com**

## Articles, Manuals and Websites mentioned

I've been working on a handout or pamphlet about program evaluation that is kind of a beginners guide. I hope I can ask folks for some feedback. [http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/evaluati onbeginnersguide .pdf](http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/evaluati%20onbeginnersguide.pdf)  
**Gene Shackman, Ph.D.** [gsocialchange@yahoo.com](mailto:gsocialchange@yahoo.com)

I wonder how you will react to this. I got your pamphlet this morning and it coincide with my M&E training, I hope to test run it by given it to all the participants to read and comment. I will get back to you on their comment and hopefully that will improve the work. Meanwhile let me congratulate you on the work.

**Olanipekun Oluwasola** [olanipekunsola@yahoo.com](mailto:olanipekunsola@yahoo.com)

I have just finished a posting on the subject of "Evaluating the Guardian's role in the Katine project" at <http://evaluatingkatine.wordpress.com/>  
I would be very interested in any comments you might have on this subject. Feel free to post them on the Evaluating Katine blog (<http://evaluatingkatine.wordpress.com/>) or via this email list, especially comments on how to evaluate donor websites that relate to a project of concern  
And what other websites could be considered a useful comparator to the Guardian Katine website (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/katine>)  
**Rick Davies** [Rick.davies@gmail.com](mailto:Rick.davies@gmail.com)

I am preparing an environmental and social management monitoring format for an agricultural project. I understand that this will be highly depend on the environmental and social management plan. However, the experiences of you guys will have great input. Therefore, i will be happy to exchange ideas with those of you who have experience in preparing such formats.  
**Haile hailat2003@yahoo.com**

Perhaps, this can help:<http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/index.htm>

### Training

My organization is currently looking at sending selected staff on M&E training within the Asia-Pacific region or beyond if a particularly good training is identified.

My organization is seeking introductory/intermediate M&E training focusing on principals, design and implementation, data collection methodologies and impact assessment.  
Please let me know if you are aware of any such trainings taking place this year.

**Leigh Mitchell** [leigh.h.mitchell@gmail.com](mailto:leigh.h.mitchell@gmail.com)

One place to look for upcoming training events organized by various national and regional evaluation associations is the website of IOCE (the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation, the over-all umbrella coordinating body of professional evaluation groups). The specific URL is <http://www.internationalevaluation.com/events/index.shtml>.

We would like to add more training events from Asia and other parts of the world. If you know of other such events that should be added to that website, let me know.

**Jim Rugh** [jimrugh@mindspring.com](mailto:jimrugh@mindspring.com)

Could you please provide me any information about upcoming M&E training in India/ Pakistan/ Thailand/ Bangladesh. Two or more of our M&E Department staff are interested in M&E training any of these countries.

**Mujibor Rahaman** [mujiboritdg@yahoo.com](mailto:mujiboritdg@yahoo.com)

IMA International are delivering M&E courses in Bangkok, Thailand from 10 November to 28 November 2008. Further information can be found on [www.imainternational.com](http://www.imainternational.com)  
**Nicky David** [nicky@imainternational.com](mailto:nicky@imainternational.com)

The University of Melbourne in Australia has M and E training in its education department. Measure evaluation also supports M and E training at master's level (M&E with public health - in South Africa)

**Kamoga Joseph** [kamogajos@yahoo.com](mailto:kamogajos@yahoo.com)

You may be interested in these two adjacent "Most Significant Change" (MSC) workshops, to be held on **24-25 and 27-28 November, 2008 in Delhi, India.**

We expect these two workshops to address the needs of two different groups of people. Ideally the results of the first workshop will feed into and enrich the second workshop.

**The first two-day workshop (24-25th November) is for participants who have some experience with the use of MSC and who want to learn more, (from other participants and the facilitators) about how to improve its use. Workshop title: Innovations in the use of the "Most Significant Change" (MSC) Technique. REFLECTION WORKSHOP**  
**The second two-day workshop (27-28th November) is for those who are new to MSC, and who want to learn how to use it. Workshop title: The "Most Significant Change" (MSC) Technique. TRAINING WORKSHOP**

The flyers for the two workshops can be found here: [advanced workshop](#) and [beginners workshop](#)

The workshops will be run by Rick Davies and Veronica Magar  
The workshops are being organised and hosted by [PRAXIS, Institute for Participatory Practices, Delhi](#)

Bookings and enquiries should be made through Praxis. Their contact details are:

PRAXIS, C-75 South-Ext II, New Delhi, 110049

Tel: +91 (0) 11 41642348/49/50/51 Ext. 222

E-mail: [raffaellac@praxisindia.org](mailto:raffaellac@praxisindia.org)

PLEASE do not apply to participant in both workshops.

**Rick Davies** [rick.davies@gmail.com](mailto:rick.davies@gmail.com)

I kindly ask whether there are free online M&E training  
**Bahaeldin Taha** [bahaeldintaha@hotmail.com](mailto:bahaeldintaha@hotmail.com)

Yes, Bahaeldin, you can receive free online training on M&E at the following sites: [www.inforforhealth.org](http://www.inforforhealth.org)

[www.iadb.org](http://www.iadb.org)

**Austin Udechukwu** [austin2ng@yahoo.com](mailto:austin2ng@yahoo.com)

MEASURE Evaluation offers free training resources and an interactive course on M&E Fundamentals here: <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/training/mentor>

**Leah Gordon** [leah.gordon@unc.edu](mailto:leah.gordon@unc.edu)

Check out the MandE list of training opportunities:

[www.mande.co.uk/category/coming-events/training](http://www.mande.co.uk/category/coming-events/training)

**Teddy Kristedi** [kristedi@hotmail.com](mailto:kristedi@hotmail.com)

**Summary compiled by:**

**Nicky David Administrator**

IMA International, Drummond House, High Street, Hurst-pierpoint, BN6 9RE, UK

Tel +44 (0)1273 833030 Fax +44 (0)1273 833230

Registered in England No. 1736582

[www.imainternational.com](http://www.imainternational.com)