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Dr. Manibhai Desai Management Training Centre of BAIF, India, organised in collaboration with the Evaluation Unit of the International Development Centre, Canada, a two-day International Workshop on Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Strategic Management and Organisational Development. The workshop was held on February 17-18, 1997 at BAIF’s campus in Pune with a view:

* To gain an understanding of how a range of development research organisations currently use M&E to achieve their mission.
* To promote shared understanding of M&E processes.
* To enhance organisational learning and effectiveness in the light of the M&E experiences of the participating organisations.
* To identify the need for systematizing M&E activities including methodologies and tools to meet the requirements of development research organisations.

Participants included 18 senior executives or representatives of 17 development research organisations (14 from India, 2 from Nepal and one from Bangladesh) and members of the workshop organisation and steering committee. The committee consisted of the following:

**Facilitators**
- Prof. Ranjit Gupta (formerly, Professor and Chairman of Centre for Management in Agriculture and Centre of Educational Innovation at the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad), Independent Consultant, Goa, India.
- Dr. Fred Carden, IDRC, Ottawa, Canada.

**Resource Persons**
- Ms. Diana Lee Smith, Mazingira Institute, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Dr. T.V. Rao (formerly, Professor, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad), Chairman, Academic Committee, Academy of Human Resources Development, Hyderabad, India.
- Prof. Ashoke Chatterjee (formerly, Director, National Institute of Design, Ahmedabad), Senior Faculty, NID, Ahmedabad.

**BAIF Executives**
- Mr. Girish Sohani, Executive Vice President, BAIF Development Research Foundation, Pune, India.
- Ms. Mona Dhamankar, Coordinator, Training, Manibhai Desai Management Training Centre, Pune, India.

The committee met several times to work out the workshop design, to coordinate the two-day deliberations in accordance with this design, and to facilitate the drafting of the workshop report.
The report which follows is presented in two parts. Part 1 contains three chapters. The first or the introductory chapter summarises the issues and concerns raised in the background papers specifically prepared for the workshop. These were also the concerns which led BAIF and IDRC to organise the workshop. Chapter 2 narrates and analyses:

- the presentations made by the resource persons to clarify and elaborate the concepts underlying Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) as a process, its current applications, and the scope or need to shift the role of M&E from the generally perceived "control" or "policing function" by donor agencies to self-managed function of development organisations themselves to promote organisational development and learning;
- participants' comments and observations on the presentations thus made; and
- the consensus that emerged from the workshop deliberations.

Chapter 3 presents a synthesis or a reflective overview of the workshop deliberations as a whole - the issues raised and the ideas shared by the participants. The recommendations for follow-up action that emerged from these discussions are also enumerated towards the close of this chapter.

Part II contains a collection of four background papers specifically prepared for the workshop, the schedule and structure of the workshop, and the names and addresses of those who participated in it.

It is hoped that the report will be found useful not only by individuals and organisations involved in development research and action but also by the national and international agencies supporting such research and action through financial and technical assistance.

March 15, 1997
Pune

Ranjit Gupta
PART 1
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Many organisations in the South involved in development research or development action or both have been primarily the subject of evaluation rather than the clients for (or users of) evaluation. Such evaluations are usually focussed on the primary interests of the donor - those programmes which it funds including whether or not to continue funding - and not on the organisational requirements and growth of the institution being evaluated.

"Donor evaluations", to quote Stephen Salewicz, "conducted during or after project implementation, have traditionally tended to focus on issues of accountability - of reviewing programme achievements against objectives. Evaluations, as practiced by donors, therefore, has been a form of inspection and judgement and as such, have been perceived by recipient institutions (those organizations which receive donor technical assistance and funding) as organizational threats. Reflecting emerging trends in evaluation, however, donors have recently made some efforts to shift evaluation away from its traditional role as a mechanism for control to a tool that can contribute to organizational learning. This shift in focus and intent has implications for the design of evaluations, but more importantly for recipient institutions, it has created an opportunity for them to use evaluation to reflect on and learn from experience and thereby strengthen their capacity for organizational planning and management." 1

Continuing he writes: "A number of obstacles inhibit evaluation's expanded use by development organizations in general, and research development organizations specifically ... First, development research itself has a long time frame which means it is difficult to link research activity directly to development results. The impact of outputs (e.g. technological innovations, policy recommendation, journal articles, etc) flowing from research development projects often take years to influence or contribute to development. Using evaluation to 'measure' the contribution of individual outputs is difficult since in the interim a host of contending factors may have had an influence on the adoption or rejection of the research findings as well as their impact ... Trying to isolate the impact or contribution of the original research from these 'intervening variables' is methodologically difficult, if not impossible. This task is made all the more difficult since evaluation is usually conducted as an 'add on' to a project after it has been up and running for a substantial period of time. Data is rarely collected systematically from the outset of a project with the intent of using it for evaluation purposes; instead, evaluators are often forced to comb through project files, conduct interviews, etc in an effort to backtrack and try to find the information they require. As a consequence, evaluation takes the form of argument and demonstration rather than firm data.

1
"A second obstacle to the expanded use of evaluation by recipient institutions is that evaluation tends to be donor-organized and driven. Evaluations of development projects are rarely if ever initiated by recipient institutions; instead donors require the evaluation and they set the agenda for its implementation and use. This has fundamental implications for the orientation of the evaluation: the primary users of the evaluations - the donors - determine key issues such as the function the evaluation should serve, what information should be sought and for what purposes. When evaluations are conducted using criteria selected by donors the decision making authority of the recipients is reduced. This prevents evaluation from being used as a management tool. Moreover, because issues of interest to the recipient institutions are not explored or examined, it is more difficult for the researchers to use the results."²

Besides IDRC, other international donors such as the OECD, the World Bank and US AID have made some movement towards assisting Southern government agencies and organisations to strengthen their M & E capacity. Through their efforts they have introduced monitoring concepts, trained local staff in the design and implementation of evaluations and in some cases provided equipment and logistical support to conduct such studies.

Commentators have suggested, however, that international efforts have been marked by a number of weaknesses. Stokke notes that capacity building by OECD bilateral aid agencies is still in its infancy and is characterised as donor driven exercise: few efforts have been made "to involve Third World governments in the process to improve their evaluation capacity."³ The donor-driven nature of the process is confirmed by Valdez and Bamberger who report that although development banks such as the World Bank have assisted national agencies to develop a project monitoring capacity "the terms of reference and the scope of the monitoring tend to be determined more by the concerns of the donor than by the interests of the borrower."⁴ Snyder and Doan examined USAID's practices vis-a-vis M & E and found that although it recognised in its evaluation guidelines the importance of developing institutional capacity for evaluation and planning, it does not include any specific requirements for staff to meet its commitment. As a consequence, despite the expressed goal of promoting the use of indigenous practitioners in USAID evaluations, "much of the evaluation experience is acquired by and remains with those who are foreigners in the country where the programmes and policies are operating."⁵

Stephen Salewicz' paper (included in Part II of this report) offers several other insights. To quote :⁶

1. Evaluation is a political activity : Although individual evaluators may attempt to adopt an objective stance, the programs or projects they review are supported (or not supported as the case may be) by multiple stakeholders - individuals/agencies/organisations - with their own unique (and often contending) interests and perspectives (Palumbo, 1987). Since any decision made regarding
the nature of project or programming efforts is likely to have an impact on each of the stakeholders, each of them, therefore, seek to influence the process of evaluation for their own ends. Questions that need to be negotiated by stakeholders include such basic ones as: Should an evaluation be conducted? What should be the focus of the evaluation (e.g. effectiveness, sustainability of activities, impact)?

2. *It is in this context that participation in, or ownership over the evaluation process becomes crucial*: Evaluation is a source of power to those who control the system and a threat to organisations or groups that do not retain this control (Valadez and Bamberger, 1994). *Given their control over the process, it is not surprising that donors use evaluation to meet their own needs and not those of the recipient institutions.*

3. *Frequently, evaluations are initiated and conducted on the ground by evaluators from the North often with little or no involvement of managers from the recipient institutions.* A recent study by Snyder and Doan (1995) highlights this point. Reviewing a sample of 177 USAID mid-term and final project evaluations they found that implementing agency personnel participated in only one-quarter of them as team members. A number of reasons explain the low representation of indigenous personnel on evaluation teams: the absence of a systematic policy on the part of donors to include recipient personnel on evaluation teams; a lack of trained personnel within the recipient institutions with the required background and expertise; donors’ perceptions that recipient participation would undermine the objective nature of the evaluation; the requirement for donors to contract practitioners who understand their own information needs in the context of ever-changing home environments. One consequence of donor reliance on external Northern consultants is that recipient institutions miss out on crucial opportunities to strengthen their capacity to independently design and implement their own M & E activities ... This creates a situation in which donors assist research institutions to build their capacity to conduct meaningful research but do not assist them to the same degree to strengthen their ability to evaluate this research and improve management practices.

4. *The experience of recipient organizations, therefore, has not been of a process which can assist them in strengthening their organization but rather of a process which threatens them with funding cuts or externally imposed changes to programming.* Without in-house evaluation expertise, the institutions cannot approach working with a donor on an evaluation as an equal partner. *Their role, as a result, becomes that of an entity reacting instead of guiding the process.* In this role, their contribution to the evaluation in terms of design, stakeholder identification, etc is diminished along with the value of the findings for their own management purposes. *Indeed, because it is positioned as a policing mechanism and not as a tool for organizational learning, the actual generated benefits are limited.*
5. Carlen argues that if evaluation is going to serve as a learning function, its role must shift from an exercise of power to the purpose of empowerment. Associated with this shift in evaluation's role is the need for the development of new methodologies because the issues explored and the questions asked are fundamentally different for each type of evaluation. Some movement has been made in this direction with the development of, for example, tools for institutional self-assessment, but this remains a rich preserve open to further research.

One lesson that clearly follows from the foregoing discussion is that development organisations need to build their internal capability to use monitoring processes and conduct evaluation as a learning devise. More extensive internal use of M&E can assist them not only in building their own strengths, but can also influence and guide the engine which drives the external evaluation. If an internal capacity and function exist, it is likely that the products and activities of the organisation itself will inform and guide the external evaluation. This will help the organisation in gaining more control over its own research agenda.

Organisations that remain viable and keep growing are those in which management continually monitors the external environment and takes stock of the organisation's skills and resources and formulates strategies to ensure the best fit between external threats and opportunities and internal strengths and weaknesses. In a sense, this is what constitutes the essence of Strategic Management. Since every institution faces a unique environment there is no one optimum strategy. Moreover, because the internal and external environments are never in equilibrium, but are in a constant state of flux, institutions must continuously reexamine their environments over time and modify their corresponding strategies to produce the right fit.

It is in this context that learning becomes crucial for the long-term health and survival of a development organisation. Stated simply, "Organisational learning ... means changes in what the organisation knows and how it acts (Fross et al., 1994: 575). Argyris and Schon (1978), two leading voices in organisational development theory, define organisational learning as a 'process of detecting and correcting error' where 'correcting error' is given as shorthand for a complex learning cycle in which organisations adjust to external and internal forces." 7

The learning organisation concept demands a commitment by an organisation to put in place practices that contribute to the creation of a learning culture. "Although much of the literature does not explicitly identify a role for evaluation, many of the suggested practices overlap space already occupied by evaluation. For instance, according to Garvin (1993), learning organisations are skilled at five main activities: systematic problem solving, experimentation with new approaches, learning from their own experiences and past history, learning from the experiences and best practices of others, and transferring knowledge quickly and efficiently throughout the organisation." 8
Recent work by the World Conservation Union (IUCN, 1996) also offers some insights into the characteristics of development institutions which learn while they act - what they call a 'reflective institution.' "What is noteworthy about this research is the explicit positioning of monitoring and evaluation within the reflective institution's activities: monitoring and evaluation of activities and projects is not so much a discrete task as a way of thinking which permeates the structures and practices of an institution" (IUCN. 1996)."  

It is these issues and concerns, experiences, findings and recommendations that motivated BAIF and IDRC to jointly organise and host the present workshop. It was conceived and organised in recognition of the need that development organisations being exposed to ever-changing external and internal environment it is vitally important that they acquire and strengthen the capacity to monitor and react to environmental changes. M&E as a form of reflection and learning may serve to keep organisations abreast of these changes. It is not the only method for collecting information and data to inform strategic management and planning but it can contribute strongly to organisational learning process. Its contribution can be even greater if it is integrated into activities that promote the development of a learning organisation.

REFERENCES
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6 - 9: Stephen Salewicz, Ibid.
Chapter 2

UNDERSTANDING AND USING M&E FOR ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Development organisations in the South, whether devoted to development research or development action, are generally not well acquainted with M&E either as a concept or as a discipline as it is generally understood and practiced by donor agencies in the North. This does not mean that development organisations in the South do not monitor the functioning and progress of the organisation or evaluate the outcomes to take various decisions - policy, managerial, organisational and institutional. One of the terms many of them use to refer to such M&E processes is Review or Internal Review without defining or elaborating what exactly these processes are and how these used to facilitate the realization of organisational goals.

Considering this difference in the usage and practice of M&E in the two hemispheres - the North and the South, the donor and the recipient - and the resultant misconception or gap in understanding, the first working session of the workshop was devoted to clarification of concepts, particularly "understanding of M&E as an internal review process." It was hoped that, besides clarifying concepts, the session would help promoting shared understanding of the purpose and relevance of M&E / Review Process for both implementation of programmes / projects and organisational learning.

Definition, Methodologies, Uses and Benefits of M&E

Dr. T.V. Rao, (resource person), who initiated and steered the discussion, defined M&E as a "review or assessment of progress towards pre-set goals with a view to take corrective action" such as mid-course correction, accelerating progress towards mission goals, even re-defining goals. Some other benefits that could be realised through M&E, according to him, are:

- Building confidence within the organisation
- Developing knowledge and /or promoting learning
- Changing tools (operational, managerial, policy etc)
- Identifying problems as well as development needs
- Enhancing accountability
- Giving a sense of direction.

M&E could be also used to plan or start (i) a new project, (ii) a new programme, or (iii) a new institution. In the context of organisational development, the variables to be considered by M&E processes are:

1. Inputs, in terms of tools and technology, people and their competencies, systems and their functions.
2. Processes related to mission or goals and their relevance, the needs of the beneficiaries, changes in culture, values and such other soft variables.
3. Outputs, in terms of structures and their appropriateness, roles and relationships, etc.

He listed the following as some of the methodologies that can be used by development organisations to conduct M&E:

* Information collection through questionnaires, study of records, organisational surveys
* Workshops, group discussions, meetings
* Brainstorming, problem-solving sessions
* Observations
* Review committees, task forces, etc.

Concluding his presentation Rao emphasised that M&E can be and have been conducted by the following bodies or groups:

i) The organisation itself through:
   * Internal teams
   * Internal review systems such as weekly/monthly meetings
   * Internal surveys
   * Renewal workshops
   * Annual appraisals

ii) External agents/agencies such as:
   * Donor agencies
   * Sister institutions
   * Donor appointed consultants
   * Consultants or experts appointed by the organisation staff.

iii) Stake-holders/beneficiaries

iv) Combination of two or more of the foregoing agencies/methods.

**Issues and Concerns: Participants' Feedback**

Rao's usage of the term "pre-set goals" in the M&E definition was questioned by some of the participants. In the process the following issues were raised:

* Frequent modification of course of action because of non-achievement of project/programme goals could be due to poor monitoring or rigidity of project/programme goals, or lack of proper indicators.
• Whether making mid-course correction will lead to the dilution of the original (mission) goal?

• Clarity is needed about the ultimate mission of the organisation, which will guide the decisions taken as an organisation, and in case of projects, the decisions that lead to that particular (organisational) goal. Deviations occur because organisations do not monitor and evaluate. They do not set out indicators and often there is no discipline to accept and use indicators to monitor and assess what is being done. Therefore, there is a feeling that everything is postponable.

• In mid-course correction, while addressing the issue of change in strategies or action, there is need to consider an alternative (probably diverse) set of actions about how to achieve ‘the goal’ rather than to strengthen bureaucratic, single line of action.

• Knowledge building in the context of M&E, though important, is in itself not sufficient. It should be further used to influence policy.

• It is useful to differentiate what is organisational from that which is institutional. An organisation has more to do with tasks, activities, roles and responsibilities (that is, the hard variables), whereas an institution has to do with mission, vision, value system, culture, etc (that is, the soft variables). In the institutional mode all individuals are equal. Hierarchies, rules, projects operate only in the organisational mode. This difference influences the individuals’ attitude towards M&E. In an organisational setting, the person is likely to be more defensive as she/he becomes the subject of monitoring. The organisational mode may however lead to action-plans. In an institutional mode, as the focus is on soft variables, not individuals, people participate and suggest indicators more constructively which often leads to organisational learning. Though certain issues may overlap between the two modalities, they could be dealt with separately. Acceptance of this dual reality is crucial to both organisational learning and institution building. It is important to be aware of the overlaps and avoid institutionalising what is organisational. If organisational elements are institutionalised, then the ability to respond to demand emanating from changes in external environment is reduced and the institution may become inflexible and redundant in course of time.

  **Organisational Mission And Review Processes**

While welcoming the invitation to present and share their respective organisational missions, most of the participating organisations found it difficult to do so for the following reason:

• Until recently development organisations in the South, particularly in India, neither considered it relevant nor found it necessary to formulate and spell out mission statements. The practice then was - and in many organisations
continues to be even now - to spell out the objectives of the organisation in their constitution or memorandum of association and work in areas / sectors of primary concern to them such as rural development, poverty alleviation, income generation, natural resource management, health and sanitation, education, enhancement of women's status, etc. Defining organisational mission and putting it down in the form of a 'mission statement' is a recent practice followed primarily by development organisations with professional orientation, which in itself is a recent phenomenon. (The BAIF representative participating in the discussion illustrated the point by explaining that though BAIF has been actively involved in the development sector for three decades and has made significant contributions throughout this period, it formulated and spelt out its mission statement only recently).

Some of the participants, however, indicated that their organisations do have a clearly stated 'organisational mission statement' and assured that if required they would mail the statement to the workshop organisers. But it was generally felt that instead of spending time on elaborating or reciting organisational mission statements of numerous organisations participating in the workshop, it would be better to use the available time to discuss "how does one monitor and evaluate organisational mission?" This led to the identification of the following questions or issues:

- Is evaluation of organisational mission done by comparing what has been achieved vis-a-vis what the organisation had set out to achieve - if not, does it mean that the mission is wrong, and needs to be changed?

- Mission is something like a guiding star - one cannot measure how close one is to it. One can only check and evaluate the direction; to measure, one should be able to see the path and how much of it has been covered. One has to be practical and view the mission in a broad context.

- Linkages between mission and short-term goals need to be well understood.

- Identification of M&E within the organisation is equally important.

- There is a need to look at the purpose of organisation with respect to three types of objectives:
  - Mission-oriented objectives - social and developmental commitments which determine the direction in which the organisation seem to be going. (M&E in this case would be like a navigation chart mapping the social change).
  - Objectives related to efficiency of the organisation - use of resources (human, financial, material).
Objectives which relate to donor requirements - in consideration of their sector-specific, area-specific, thrust and priorities.

Questions like "why are we doing what we are doing?" Could be the starting point of the reflection process. This could lead to re-examining mission statements and even check the validity of the mission in terms of the need to broaden its scope to accommodate changing environments - being pushed into areas of work by donors and government and in the process spreading the organisation too thin and making it ineffective. Reflection/renewal processes if carried out in time can help to control and tighten such situations, link the mission to current situations, re-build confidence and remove frustrations.

Identification of the foregoing questions/issues, particularly the one listed at the end, led the participants to raise (and respond to) the question "what processes or methods their organisations use to carry out informal review not so much with a view to evaluate but more importantly to promote organisational learning". The methods or processes they enumerated in response varied from one organisation to another, though some of the methods appeared to be similar, if not exactly the same, in two or more organisations:

- Retreat (annual retreat in case of one organisation and 3 day faculty retreat per semester in case of another)
- Performance appraisal (including self-evaluation by each faculty member in one organisation)
- Task forces (to address specific organisational/institutional issues)
- Periodic meetings (in some organisations: weekly or monthly, some other: six monthly and / or annually) of senior staff members, even board members
- Peer review, internal newsletter, anonymous feedback
- Advisory committees
- Think tank
- Study group, expert consultation
- Pilot projects
- Feedback from clients/beneficiaries/support groups
- Process review
- Stakeholders involvement in the use or application of research results towards strategy formulation, performance assessment, project impact, etc.

Methods, Techniques And Tools Of M&E

Diana Lee - Smith, resource person, presented a synthesis of the methods, techniques and tools of M&E based on the assumption that "the role and perception of evaluation must change if it is to provide a reflection of the learning which takes place in research."
The changes which are implicit in such a shift are:

- changing perspectives on evaluation,
- changing patterns in development, and
- changing patterns in research for development

Thus viewed, the methods and tools should be directed towards monitoring and evaluation of:

- the internal organisational environment,
- the internal institutional environment,
- the linkages between institutional assessment and programme and project level assessment.

She also drew attention to IDRC’s framework for institutional assessment as one addressing four levels of assessment, which can be used by any organisation for carrying out self-assessment:

1. **Organisation’s environment**: Administrative, legal, technological, political, economic, social, cultural, stakeholders.
2. **Institutional motivation**: History, mission, culture, incentives.
3. **Institutional capacity**: Strategic leadership, human resources, other core resources, programme management, process management, inter-institutional links.
4. **Institutional performance**: Movement towards mission, efficient use of resources, relevance.

She listed two specific tools useful for linking institutional assessment to programme and project evaluations, viz:

1. The **intent structure**, which can be used for various purposes, including programme evaluation, investigation of success or progress towards the realisation of organisation mission, display of evaluation outcomes, and selection of performance indicators.
2. The **issue based format**, which is used as an agenda for discussion between stakeholders. It is also called “the argumentative approach” because it allows people with different positions to argue constructively based on evaluation data.

**Requirements For Systematizing M&E Activities**

Diana’s presentation of the tools to use M&E for institutional assessment and strategic management served as an introduction to the work that the participants undertook in four small groups to identify the requirements for systematizing M&E activities.

For further details including how to use these tools, see background paper in Part II of this report: “Role of M&E in Strategic Management and Organisational Development”, by Diana Lee-Smith.
Basically, the four groups probed and discussed two inter-related questions:

1. To systematize M&E activities / efforts:
   a) What needs to be continued and reinforced?
   b) What needs to be changed: added and / or discontinued?

2. To link development organisations for enlarging the use of M&E what needs to be done to promote:
   a) mutual learning? and
   b) capacity development?

The requirements identified and shared by the four groups in a plenary session are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear mission statement has to exist.</td>
<td>1. Internal reflections should take place more often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A formal M&amp;E system must be in place.</td>
<td>2. The objective of periodic meetings should be constructive learning rather than “reporting”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will involve:</td>
<td>3. Present internal reporting systems should be ‘impact’ based (not input based).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Manualisation</td>
<td>4. M&amp;E processes should be more analytical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Terms of reference of planning</td>
<td>5. Annual reports of organisations should also report failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Specification and use of time frame, feedback channels, self appraisals.</td>
<td>6. Forum for sharing among NGOs has to be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create a culture of learning and develop analytical capacity.</td>
<td>7. Inter-organisational collaboration for documentation of experiences is necessary for effective time-sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establish fora for sharing</td>
<td>8. Task forces should be formed within organisations to look into specific OD issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Peer review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Workshops - within the organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There has to be a facilitator within the organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Give emphasis on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Autonomy of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Quality of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 3
1. Cascade institutional M&E to all levels.
2. Upgrade skills for M&E.
3. Build M&E into a project, a planning level.
4. There has to be transparency between collaborating organizations.
5. Stop data overloading.
6. Develop and use organisations own formats or negotiate donor format.
7. Routinise M&E to habituate.
8. Budgets /controls and organisational mechanism have to be added.
9. Evaluation, long term review, institutional assessment, are all important and necessary.
11. Review government as a donor.
12. Feedback M&E results to stakeholders.
13. Establish forum for sharing of M&E results among NGOs, also for coordinated planning & action.
15. Build forum of donors & NGOs for mutual learning.
16. Demystify M&E.
17. Cross units between organisations to learn.

Group 4
1. Elaborate how to use or translate mission / concepts at operational level, or with participants.
2. Greatest obstacle is continuous change in external environment.
3. Commitment to M&E /OD has to be built at all levels.
4. Training is required for capacity building.
5. Communication techniques to share objectives of M&E are also required.
6. Learning from experience, progress, success has to be built in.

Reaching a Consensus

Following the presentation and discussion of the small group reports the participants agreed that:

- M&E is useful not only to satisfy donors but even more to promote organisational development.
- M&E should be participatory in nature.
- It should not be confined only to certain levels within the organisation but should be an organisation-wide exercise, cascading through all levels.
- Its objective and processes should be toward continuous upgradation of expertise and technical know-how within an organisation.
• It should start with and result into “action”.
• It should be used not so much for evaluation as for planning.
• It should be used for planning of withdrawal.
• Capacity building within an organisation - training in nuts & bolts, the “how to” - is required.
• There is a need to demystify M&E processes, to make them more approachable through inter-organisational sharing of experiences including failures or mistakes.

Discussion involving fine tuning of the various alternatives and suggestions made by the small groups helped short-listing these ideas and classifying them as follows:

1. **Systematization of M&E Activities**

   a) **At Intra-organisational level** : To be done by organisations themselves:

      • Discuss failures and reasons behind successes
      • Formalise M&E systems
      • Strengthen analytical capacity
      • Create fora of sharing
      • Build capacity of facilitation of OD
      • Cascade 'Institutional' M&E to all levels
      • Build M&E into Planning
      • Work on methods for sharing Mission / concepts at operational level or with participants
      • Establish / identify training resources for capacity building.

   b) **At Extra-organisational level** : To be done by donor agencies:

      • Express appreciation for learning from failures
      • Negotiate donor evaluation formats / framework
      • Feedback on M&E results to stakeholders
      • Donor includes governments (for influencing policy)
      • Forum of NGOs & Donors for mutual learning.

2. **For Mutual Learning / Capacity Building** (Inter-Organisational level)

(a & b) **At Inter-organisational level**:

     • Share – discuss failures and reasons behind successes
     • Joint projects
     • Fora for sharing / discussion
     • Inter-agency transparency
     • Information exchange (Internet - ?)
     • Cross visits
Chapter 3

A REFLECTIVE OVERVIEW

A question that is often raised at the conclusion of a workshop but seldom answered is: "What did the workshop accomplish? Did it accomplish the objectives which prompted or motivated the organisers to convene it?" The answer in the case of the workshop under review is "No" for one and 'Yes' for the remaining three objectives stated in the Preface.

The objective that the workshop could not accomplish is: "to gain an understanding of a how a range of development organisations currently use M&E to achieve their mission". The reason it could not realise this objective lay in the fact that M&E is viewed and used by development research organisations (donor agencies) in the North and South differently. Development organisations in the South, particularly NGOs in India involved in development, are used to reviewing and evaluating organisational performance and progress through what they generally refer to as "Internal Review Process"; not through M&E as it is generally viewed or practiced as a discipline in the North. Attempt to define "organisational mission" and to record or proclaim the 'mission' through written statement is also not a normal practice. Instead most NGOs or development organisations in the South, particularly in India, follow the practice of defining and stating the objectives of the organisation in their constitution or memorandum of association and get involved in projects, programmes, activities in areas or sectors of primary concern to them.

This being the case the participants decided to discuss, analyse and understand M&E as an "internal review process", and issues and concerns related to its use including the need to enlarge its scope to promote organisational learning and development. This shift encouraged the participants to relate the discussions towards achieving the remaining three workshop objectives, namely:

1. Promoting a common or shared understanding of M&E as Internal Review Process;
2. Identifying the need for systematizing M&E activities, methodologies and tools to meet the requirements of development research organisations, and
3. Understanding the need to view and use M&E as a self-managed internal process to promote organisational learning and development leading to institution building.

The review which follows deals with these aspects with emphasis on presenting a synthesis of the analyses and understanding that emerged from the two-day deliberations. The synthesis is presented in terms of the types or categories of issues discussed, namely:

I. Obstacles to acceptance and use of M&E
II. Requirements for culture of learning
III. Need to develop mission-related indicators
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IV. M&E as a means for reflection and learning
V. What do we monitor?
VI. NGO-Donor profiles including M&E outcomes
VII. Organisational Vs institutional tasks
VIII. Recommendations for follow-up actions.

1.  Obstacles to Acceptance and Use of M&E

1. One of the major hurdles obstructing the acceptance and use of M&E by development organisations is the widespread perception validated in varying measures by past experiences is that M&E is an accounting and policing function.

2. Another equally severe obstacle is the image M&E has acquired as a donor-driven activity - something the development organisations have to do because the donors who give money demand it of them. Donors include central and state authorities as also the bilateral agencies. Government’s own understanding of M&E and the way it reports back to the donors who assist government programmes is important because the donor pressure is not only on the recipient organisations. In many cases the development organisations go through a double cycle -- what the donor demands of the government and what they demand from the organisations. The helplessness the latter feels, while satisfying a variety of donor requirements, effects their efforts and the quality of the M&E processes they use.

3. A third obstacle, more pertinent in terms of scale in the Indian context, is the pre-occupation with “success stories”. It is the inability to deal with and to acknowledge the learning that comes from failures. There is nothing in the system that tolerates failure - as if individual’s and organisation’s future depend wholly upon their adherence to the so-called “success stories”. This preoccupation with success rather than with learning is a major obstacle that needs to be bridged if M&E is to adopted, used and promoted as a learning tool.

4. There is a tendency among NGOs to neglect the dialogic processes and dialogic skills. The booklet on Reflective Institutions states that perhaps even within organisations in the NGO sector - among organisations which are often seen as highly successful and which themselves promote a culture of dialogue - dialogue does not take place. Charismatic leadership is seen as a substitute for that dialogue notwithstanding the fact that institutions tend to collapse when the charismatic leader disappears.

5. There is a pre-occupation with immediate and (so called) more practical needs, which becomes another obstacle. Reflection is often misconstrued as day-dreaming. There is a need for institutions to build spaces for reflection, for the kind of mechanisms M&E might require. The question is “where are the spaces for reflection, who protects and tries to enlarge such spaces?”.
Tea-rooms and corridors perhaps are the most important spaces for reflection which need to be cultivated. It needs management time to take the corridors and tea-rooms as the most important space for reflection.

II Requirements for Culture of Learning

These obstacles suggest a need to look more carefully at the ecology of the social, political and economic thought within which organisations live and work. Institutions working for economic and social change are challenged by the fact that the concepts of what needs to change, or what needs to be achieved and how can it be achieved remain unclear. Ideologies are collapsing all around. They do not offer any clarity, nor do they support the sense of being anchored to something durable.

It is in this context that research for development becomes vital. Because if organisations do not know where they want to go and why, how can they hope to reach their goal or succeed in attracting help, the help that is needed along the way. The idea of a navigation chart seems to be essential to promoting the culture of learning that M&E seeks to promote*.

III Need to Develop Mission Related Indicators

The inability to find or evolve some kind of indicator to look at the mission effect the process of selecting indicators for specific projects and programmes. Some of the specific requirements identified in this context are:

1. Identification of needs refers to selection of the development requirement that becomes the organisation’s area of work.

* To illustrate that often the donors themselves do not have a culture of learning and therefore act as a barrier to the growth of this culture, the following case was cited:

In 1995, a massive advertising campaign on AIDS Awareness and Control was launched in Maharashtra. This expensive campaign was meant to satisfy World Bank-UNDP requirement of money being spent to educate the public in Maharashtra. The campaign was taken up without a single counselling facility being in position. In Mumbai, the reaction to this was catastrophic. Doctors and hospitals were forced to cope with a level of public awareness which was not only low but characterised by fear and wild rumours. People were encouraged by the campaign to ask questions. But who could they ask questions to? In Mumbai, the reaction to this was catastrophic. Doctors and hospitals were forced to cope with a level of public awareness which was not only low but characterised by fear and wild rumours. People were encouraged by the campaign to ask questions. But who could they ask questions to? Besides an already over-burdened system which had many other tasks to attend to, there was none to attend to their questions. The doctors were furious; the people were angry, disappointed, frustrated and afraid because there was no one to deal with their concerns. The main M&E indicator was the amount of money spent on IEC - Information, Education and Communication. There were no indicators to indicate what awareness and control should mean on the ground, within those communities and people who are most directly concerned.
2. There is need to understand the changing external environment. Feedback is needed not only from within organisational learning but also from similar processes going on in entities external to the organisation such as donor, communities etc.

3. Often there is a politics involved on the question of defining mission in the form of constraints that the stakeholders impose on themselves.

4. Equality of status among the stakeholders is an issue organisations are often not in a position to negotiate around their missions - they need the money and they accept that money on the terms acceptable to those who have the money. This suggests that an environment of autonomy is a precondition for M&E to become a learning process.

5. There are two problem situations: one is extreme rigidity in the goals and the other is having to change the goals frequently. Rigidity occurs in institutional thinking; too frequent change occurs where there is non-achievement. Rigidity at one end may lead to an undesirable M&E culture within the organisation, whereas too frequent changes in goals may be an outcome of improper M&E.

6. Choice of tools, methods and processes is crucial - whether one uses a telescope where a microscope is required. Evaluation of action as against intended achievements should be done by looking into process indicators. Linking "action" to "mid-course correction" may have to be done through (microscope) M&E techniques, whereas knowledge building requires tools which view M&E as a learning process. Therefore, availability of M&E tools, techniques and processes which cover the entire spectrum of organisational requirements is important.

7. Interaction between donor and development organisations is very important to decide whether M&E will be used for learning or to evaluate performance and generate performance related statistics.

8. "Looking at alternative strategies/ actions" should be a step to insert in between the identification of opportunities and obstacles and finding a sense of direction. Overlooking alternatives prevent organisations from achieving - which is basically an attitudinal problem.

9. M&E cannot be a substitute for poor planning. It is a tool, an approach that helps planning to be more effective and designing policies that influence the mission of the organisation.

10. There is need to look at the external environment through network and partnership, within the NGO sector, to help organisations to understand the environments that are changing rapidly rather than to make adhoc responses to specific opportunities.
IV  M&E As A Means for Reflection and Learning

1. There is need to clearly define what is meant by M&E, its applications and usefulness. There is a need to differentiate the uses and merits of M&E:

   - as a thinking and learning process;
   - as an information tool and a tool for improvement;
   - as a tool for strategic management with due consideration to the difference that distinguishes the concept of strategic management from industrial / commercial point of view as against the social activists' point of view; and
   - as a means for reflection and learning vis-a-vis the mission related concerns, as against a tool for both project management and programme evaluation. (The former has a long-term perspective - a long-term vision, as against the latter which is more concerned with short-term needs. But this distinction should not be put into water tight compartments because in some cases the project / programme may itself become the mission of the beneficiaries at the grassroots. Ability to deal with such grey areas and overlaps is therefore vital).

2. From the point of view development action and research the real benchmark of M&E is whether M&E acts as a facilitator and reflector for participatory planning, action, decision making - which is what leads to empowerment.

3. The importance of programme success and of institutions that have learnt to be reflective and can learn from experience cannot be overlooked. The project mode is simply not enough in the context of the challenges around us. Actually, the distinction between M&E as a tool and as an approach and an attitude for learning, for better project management, are not distinct. The kind of projects that are taken up by NGOs depend very much upon their ability to learn and their ability to remain anchored in mission which directs and informs the kind of decisions they make about projects. And projects feeding back into the learning that they have.

4. The discomfort expressed in the usage of the term “pre-set goals” in the definition offered by Rao led to a re-examination of the concept of “pre-set goals” in the context of organisational mission - not as a permanent feature cast in stone, but as a “guiding star”; as missions which may need to be rearticulated and reset within the context of the changes in the external environment of the organisation. The re-examination led to the design presented in Figure 1. It is a rearrangement of the results of M&E with a view to link them to the culture of learning, which was the main rationale for re-looking at the results of M&E processes. Discussions in the workshop highlighted that the ultimate result defined through M&E was “knowledge building” -- knowledge building
which led to a better identification of the development needs of concern to the organisation. Within these needs, identification of the opportunities for action and the obstacles to change can be attempted by ascertaining the relevance of the organisational mission which gives a sense of direction to the actions to follow.

5. M&E at the project / programme level indicates areas for mid-course corrections, viz, changes in strategies, tools and actions. This results in accountability and also enhances peoples involvement leading to (i) greater confidence at the individual and institutional level, (ii) organisational renewal and learning, and, therefore, to (iii) knowledge building.

![Figure 1: KNOWLEDGE BUILDING](image)

6. The question, "how do we know we are succeeding?" applies to M&E at many levels. It is worthwhile considering whether the mission itself can be so scrutinised and modified in the short-term. There is a need to look at how may things are being done consistently. Whether these things are timely. The built in assumption of an information giver and an information taker needs to be studied
in terms of how the information is being used, at what levels, and by whom. Because it is possible that information exchange may take place in a manner not conducive to learning. Thus, corporate style of MIS doesn't make a learning organisation unless the individuals involved in collecting the information understand the consequence of the information being passed ahead, or there is an indication of how the information is likely to be analysed.

V What do we Monitor?

Typically M&E is confined to results - what has been achieved and / or not-achieved. The process issues - the why and how questions - which promote learning are often missed, partly because:

1. There are limited formal tools available to measure the process aspects. (Even the informal methods look only at soft variables, and not at hard variables).

2. Results are effected by both external and internal factors. While most NGOs feel fairly comfortable dealing with external environments, they hesitate to look at internal mechanisms and dynamics influencing the results.

VI NGO-Donor Profiles Influencing M&E Outcomes

1. Autonomy being very important in determining the use of M&E, the interaction between donors and NGOs becomes very critical - in terms of whether M&E can be used for development purposes or for merely to generate statistical outputs. There are certain variables which influence the use of M&E as a learning tool relate to some characteristics of the NGOs themselves, for example:

   - Whether the NGO is mission-driven or activity-driven?
   - The stage at which the NGO is - just set up (infancy), around 5 years of existence (childhood), struggling (youth), well established, known nationally-internationally due to knowledge, competency, capability (maturity);
   - The nature and extent of donor dependence.

2. Highly activity-driven NGOs, in infancy, are likely to be highly donor dependent and might use M&E mainly to meet the donor requirements. Even if they are mission-driven they may face internal conflicts due to their dependence on donors.

3. Donors could also be highly mission-driven or activity-driven. They can also be rated in terms of flexibility with respect to the mission.

4. Donors and NGOs in the name of mission really negotiate activities. This leads to a different type of dynamics when they realise that there is a mismatch and time is spent on satisfying individual requirements such as performance statistics and completing evaluation proforma. If M&E has to facilitate...
organisational learning, both donors and NGOs need to understand these dynamics and should look inward and change their profiles to facilitate this learning process. Placing the entire onus on the NGO to change will be unfair especially if the NGO is in its infancy and high on donor dependence. Even if this NGO is mission-driven, it may unknowingly be converted into an activity-driven organisation wherein M&E resulting into organisational learning will be minimum. On the other hand, if the NGO is in the maturity stage with low donor dependence and is mission-driven, it may not care for the donor. Such an NGO will make use of every possible M&E mechanism to facilitate its own development. (Figure 2).

Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Mission driven</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(high activity driven)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Infancy (initial)</td>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Dependence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td>Mission driven</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(high activity driven)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For M&E to facilitate organisational learning and development, right match is required.

VII Organisational Vs Institutional Tasks

1 There is need to recognise that it is difficult to segment organisational tasks and institutional tasks into two separate compartments. There could be an overlap. Equally, there is need to understand the external environment, and hence the need to explore the resources required to monitor the external environment (Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Tasks</th>
<th>Organizational Tasks</th>
<th>Resources For Monitoring The External Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation (Individual &amp; institutional)</td>
<td>Administrative procedures</td>
<td>User feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
<td>Programme review by senior staff</td>
<td>External review for stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group reflection (e.g. retreats)</td>
<td>internal task forces</td>
<td>Strong MIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>Meetings: annual, triennial, weekly etc.</td>
<td>Analysis of requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External review for stakeholders</td>
<td>Advisory committees</td>
<td>Donor consultation / feedback / return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional self-assessment</td>
<td>Expert consultation</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of requests</td>
<td>Donor consultation / Feedback</td>
<td>Peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor return / feedback</td>
<td>Support groups</td>
<td>External agencies / government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous feedback</td>
<td>Process review</td>
<td>Media watch / media relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>Programme review by senior staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget control</td>
<td>Meetings - annual, triennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External review for stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor / tea-room gossip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. There is also a need for a clearing-house function which can bring information to the attention of the organisations. The link between the information required and its application to decision making is extremely vital. A related question that needs to be addressed in this context is the need to link information to organisational goals, to organisational efficiency, to donor relationships and donor needs, and to renewal of organisational mission.

VIII Recommendations For follow-up Action

1. Formation of an informal network to keep in touch over the next few months for promotion of M&E for institution building and better project management.

2. During this period BAIF would act as a clearing house for acquiring ideas and information.

3. The participants should explore the possibility to develop case material on their M&E experiences.

4. The possibility of providing introductory seminars on M&E could be taken up immediately by the National Institute of Design, Ahmedabad in cooperation with the Academy of HRD, Hyderabad.

5. The need for more formal training opportunities is recognized, but it is felt premature at this stage for BAIF to offer such a training programme. However in future, training opportunities would be among the issues for participants to explore.

6. Donor support may be available for sustaining the M&E that has commenced at this workshop, but there is need for participants to articulate their requirements, and to draw out their action plans and follow up actions for which local resources (finance, human) may be raised.

7. Issues related to donors' roles that could be taken up for immediate action is a review of the existing M&E formats to focus greater attention on the institutional missions.

8. Financial and other support from external sources will depend upon the perceptions that the donor communities hold and the need for this community to recognise its role in such follow up. This would also mean that during coming weeks a regional seminar or workshop to explore the donor activities in this context may be useful.

9. It will be useful if the participating organisations report back on the needs of their own institutions for HRD/ M&E capacity building. These demands could be catalysts for the short term follow up that may be required internally.
10. There is a similar workshop proposed in East Africa in April and it may be useful to provide Ms. Diana Lee-Smith, the workshop coordinator, with information about follow-up activities. It would also be worthwhile to explore the possibility of training East African organisations in India as well as co-operation between institutions on the subcontinent and East Africa in future M&E applications.
PART 2
Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Strategic Management and Organisational Development: A Digest

- BAF Development Research Foundation

Introduction

It is increasingly recognized that to survive in an uncertain and often antagonistic environment, organisations must develop capacity for strategic management. Organizations that prove sustainable are those in which such qualities as responsiveness, innovation and the capacity for collective learning exist as part of the institutional culture. Despite M & E's relative importance as an effective planning and management tool for research development organizations, it is clear that many obstacles inhibit its expanded use. One of these is the way M & E activities are currently donor organized and donor driven.

The Problem

It is proposed that two primary factors make development research evaluation difficult to conceive and implement. First, development research itself has a long time frame which means it is difficult to link research activity directly to development results. Second, evaluation tends to be owned by donors and used mainly as an accountability tool. They require the evaluation and they set the agenda for its implementation and use.

Many institutions in the South have been primarily the subjects of evaluation rather than the clients for (or users of) evaluation. Most of the evaluations which institutions have experienced has been geared towards a determination by a donor of whether or not to continue funding. Such evaluations are usually focused on the primary interests of the donor - those programmes which it funds - and not focused on the institution as a whole. Nor is the primary focus on the issues which the institution and its actors would identify as the most important issues for sustainability of that institution. Their experience with M & E, therefore, has not been of a process which can assist them in strengthening their organization, but rather of process which threatens them with funding cuts or externally imposed changes to programming. As a result, their role is reactive instead of guiding the process; and, their contribution to the evaluation is diminished along with the value of the findings for their own management purposes.

(Source: IDRC Evaluation Unit)
If research institutions are going to benefit from M & E, ownership of the process is the crucial issue that needs to be examined. Moreover, by addressing the issue of ownership and use of evaluation, the difficulty of linking development results to research becomes less problematic: research institutions bring to evaluations an intimate understanding of the institutional, social, political and economic context in which local research programmes and projects are implemented and, as such, their expertise is a valuable source of insight in the evaluation process.

IDRC’s Experience

IDRC’s Evaluation Unit has over the past several years attempted to make its own contribution to strengthening research organizations’ capacity for evaluation. Its support on a number of Centre funded projects has been premised on a number of guiding principles. M & E activities were designed to be part of a continuous cycle-to commence at the project’s outset and continue for the duration. To avoid creating the perception that M & E was an additional burden, it was to be integrated rather than grafted onto the overall programme of work. As much as possible M & E activities were to adopt a participatory methodology with project participants sharing in the design, conduct and reporting of the evaluation work. M & E activities were presented as learning exercise and not as an external examination or as method to measure inputs.

Despite efforts to the contrary, the M & E project components often proved unsustainable. Commonly, the projects began with participants embracing M & E, but as the projects progressed its role was increasingly marginalized. A number of factors explain why participants never became fully engaged in the process:

Ownership: There was perception among some collaborating institutions that M & E activities were foisted donor driven. Reluctance to participate was grounded in part on their misgivings over the process - IDRC, through the hired evaluation consultant, was perceived as driving an “external process” and that the institutions were passive participants.

Political Will: Some senior project team members never seemed to fully embrace the notion of using M & E as a learning tool and instead continued to react in a defensive manner believing that M & E activities were being carried out not for their benefit but were being used by IDRC as a type of policing mechanism.

Local co-ordination: External consultants were employed as the primary mechanism for building capacity and providing advice and guidance. With the main proponents of the M & E effort absent from the scene for long periods, evaluation support was not readily supplied. Long-distance evaluation advisors as the only source of M & E support, therefore, proved insufficient.

Local Capacity: Project teams never possessed and indeed, never gained adequate skills to independently incorporate M & E into their projects. Workshop presentations and exercises were used as the main vehicle by consultants to introduce the latest tools and methods for evaluation. The training audience usually consisted of scientists who were expected to use the methods to
integrate M & E activities into their own projects. Although this approach is useful for fostering a general understanding of M & E among research teams the activities never built a core a evaluation expertise to occupy the M & E leadership vacuum once support from external evaluation consultants ended.

Organizational Integration: M & E activities were usually tied directly to one project and were not integrated at the institutional level. No mechanisms nor institutional culture was created to ensure the continued use of M & E - once a project ended, so did all impetus to use M & E.

Other Donors’ Experiences

Besides IDRC other international donor such as the OECD, the World Bank and US AID have made some movement towards assisting Southern government agencies and organizations to strengthen their M & E capacity. Though their efforts they have introduced monitoring concepts, trained local staff in the design and implementation of evaluations studied and provided equipment and logistical support to conduct some of these studies.

Commentators have suggested, however, that international efforts have been marked by a number weaknesses. Stokke notes that capacity building by OECD bilateral aid agencies is still in its infancy and is characterized as donor driven exercise: few efforts have been made “to involve Third World governments in the process to improve their evaluation capacity.” The donor-driven nature of the process is confirmed by Valdez and Bamberger who report that although development banks such as the World Bank have assisted national agencies to develop a project monitoring capacity “the terms of reference and the scope of the monitoring tend to be determined more by the concerns of the donor than by the interests of the borrower.” Snyder and Doan examined USAID’s practices vis-a-vis M & E and found that although it recognized in its evaluation guidelines the importance of developing institutional capacity for evaluation and planning, it does no include any specific requirements for staff to meet its commitment. As a consequence, despite the expressed goal of promoting the use of indigenous practitioners in USAID evaluations “much of the evaluation experience is acquired by and remains with those who are foreigners in the country where the programmes and policies are operating.”

Future Directions

Building an internal capacity for evaluation is critical to the use of evaluation as a learning and planned tool. More extensive internal use of evaluation can assist not only the institution in building its own strengths, but can also become the engine which drives much of the external evaluation which is done: if an internal capacity and function exists, it is likely that the products and activities of that group will inform and guide the evaluation carried. This supports the institution in gaining more control over its own research agenda.

While the Evaluation Unit has initiated a number of support activities to assist organizations to strengthen capacity for M & E it acknowledges that a greater understanding of the obstacles and
opportunities for institutionalizing M & E is required. The question still remains” how to move evaluation from a compliance mechanism to a management tool to be used by research institutions to strengthen strategic planning and decision-making.” As a next step, the Evaluation unit, in collaboration with BAIF is convening a two day workshop into bring together institutions which have some background and interest in this area with the objective of generating ideas on methods for creating a more beneficial process.

The purpose of the workshops is to explore the current role and future opportunities for the expanded use of Monitoring & Evaluation in the strategic management of research development organizations in South Asia. The workshops’ objectives are threefold: to gain an understanding of how organizations currently use M & E to achieve their mission; to identify needs for systematizing M & E activities; and, to identify appropriate and effective methodologies to meet the information needs of research organizations.

The workshop will convene for two days. It will take the form of a brainstorming session with two facilitators, one from the region and one from Canada, moderating the proceedings. Each participant will be asked to contribute by briefly reviewing the manner with which M & E is currently practiced in their organizations. As well, a series of papers will be presented that focus on specific issues related to the institutionalization of M & E. The contributions by participants and presenters alike will serve as a point of departure for extended discussions into the issues.

The participation of research organizations in the workshop will produce a number of outcomes. As a first step, a record of the characteristics of M & E as it is currently practiced in the region will be produced. As well, the workshop will facilitate the creation of an inventory of M & E methodologies and training practices employed by participating institutions. This snapshot of the “state-of-the-art” of M & E in the region will highlight the relative strengths and weaknesses of approached used and thus indicate likely avenues for improving M & E practices. As well, the workshops will identify the needs and constraints of research organizations vis-a-vis monitoring and evaluation and point to potential areas for follow-up.

BAIF and IDRC’s Evaluation Unit are inviting senior managers from established, interdisciplinary research development organizations to participate in the workshop. Because of the nature of the proposed discussions, the target audience for the workshops are individual managers who have worked with their respective organization for a period of five or more years, have research development experience in more than one sector and are currently be involved in internal operational reviews or strategic planning.

Role of M&E in Strategic Management and Organisational Development

- Stephen Salewicz
  International Development Research Centre, Canada

Introduction

Large, government-sponsored development organizations such as CIDA, USAID, ODA and IDRC regularly conduct evaluation activities to review and improve upon their operational performance. Typically, these donor organizations channel technical and financial aid to recipient countries and institutions through programs and projects with the general goal of identifying and implementing long-term, sustainable solutions to pressing development problems. (Generally, programmes are implemented over a longer time frame, are broader and more encompassing than projects which usually focus on a specific issue area within a programme.)

Donor evaluations, conducted during or after project implementation, have traditionally tended to focus on issues of accountability - of reviewing programme achievements against objectives. Evaluations, as practiced by donors, therefore, has been a form of inspection and judgement and as such, have been perceived by recipient institutions (those organizations which receive donor technical assistance and funding) as organizational threats. Reflecting emerging trends in evaluation, however, donors have recently made some efforts to shift evaluation away from its traditional role as a mechanism for control to a tool that can contribute to organizational learning. This shift in focus and intent has implications for the design of evaluations, but more importantly for recipient institutions, it has created an opportunity for them to use evaluation to reflect on and learn from experience and thereby strengthen their capacity for organizational planning and management.

Background

In the past ten years evaluation has increasingly been regarded as an important organizational learning tool to be incorporated into the management process - part of an information producing system that can help guide organizations to improve their performance in relation to their goals, constraints, resources and environment. It is increasingly recognized that to survive in an uncertain and often antagonistic environment, organizations must develop a capacity for rapid adaptability. Organizations that prove sustainable are those in which such qualities as responsiveness, innovation...
and the capacity for collective learning exist as part of their institutional culture. Despite evaluation’s potential benefit to them as a planning and management tool, however, recipient institutions still usually play a relatively minor role in the design and implementation of evaluation activities.

A number of obstacles inhibit evaluation’s expanded use by development organizations in general, and research development organizations specifically. It is proposed that two primary factors make development research evaluation difficult to conceive and implement. First, development research itself has a long time frame which means it is difficult to link research activity directly to development results. The impact of outputs (e.g. technological innovations, policy recommendation, journal articles, etc.) flowing from research development projects often take years to influence or contribute to development. Using evaluation to “measure” the contribution of individual outputs is difficult since in the interim a host of contending factors may have had an influence on the adoption or rejection of the research findings as well as their impact. For instance, did agricultural productivity increase in a given country because of the introduction of new cultivation techniques or did changes in agricultural policy, land tenure practices, etc., facilitate the change? Trying to isolate the impact or contribution of the original research from these “intervening variables” is methodologically difficult, if not impossible. This task is made all the more difficult since evaluation is usually conducted as an “add on” to a project after it has been up and running for a substantial period of time. Data is rarely collected systematically from the outset of a project with the intent of using it for evaluation purposes; instead, evaluators are often forced to comb through project files, conduct interviews, etc., in an effort to backtrack and try to find the information they require. As a consequence, evaluation takes the form of argument and demonstration rather than firm data.

A second obstacle to the expanded use of evaluation by recipient institutions is that evaluation tends to be donor-organized and driven. Evaluations of development projects are rarely if ever initiated by recipient institutions; instead donors require the evaluation and they set the agenda for its implementation and use. This has fundamental implications for the orientation of the evaluation: the primary users of the evaluations - the donors - determine key issues such as the function the evaluation should serve, what information should be sought and for what purposes. When evaluations are conducted using criteria selected by donors the decision making authority of the recipients is reduced. This prevents evaluation from being used as a management tool. Moreover, because issues of interest to the recipient institutions are not explored or examined, it is more difficult for the researchers to use the results.

If research institutions are going to benefit from M & E activities, ownership of the process is one of the crucial issues that needs to be examined. Moreover, by addressing the issue of ownership and the use of evaluation, the difficulty of linking development results to research may become less problematic. Research institutions and their projects are part of a larger research and development system. They bring to an evaluation a much broader understanding of where their organization and its activities fits within this system and as a result, they are better equipped to explain a project’s success or failure, and more importantly its impact, within the context of this
system (Murphy, 1993). Data collection is also simplified because recipients have an intimate understanding of the cultural landscape as well as the language capacity to conduct interviews, etc. Moreover, recipient involvement in project evaluation gives them a stake in data gathering activities. This means that they begin to collect critical data from the project’s outset (Lawrence, 1989). Finally, local expertise may be crucial for the analysis of sometimes complex study results (Snyder and Doan, 1995).

**Structure of the Paper**

This paper explores this second obstacle - ownership of the evaluation process. The first section reviews the unequal relationship that exists between donors and recipients in terms of control of the evaluation process and how this unequal relationship influences the structure and content of evaluations. The cumulative result is that recipient institutions do not share in the benefits of the evaluation process. Section II examines literature drawn from the fields of evaluation, business and organizational theory to understand M & E's potential role as a learning tool in strategic management and how this role can add value to a recipient organization’s operations by improving the quality of information available for decision-making. The discussion shifts in Section III, to an examination of how international donor organizations have attempted to re-structure and re-balance the relationship by strengthening the capacity of development institutions to plan and implement M & E activities. Particular attention is paid to the experiences of IDRC's Evaluation Unit. Given some of the problems encountered during these efforts the question still remains “how to move evaluation from a compliance mechanism to a tool to be used by research institutions to strengthen their management and research functions.” It is expected that the workshop at BAIF will help answer this question by having participants identify the obstacles and opportunities for the institutionalization of evaluation in their own institutions.

**I. Ownership and the Politics of Evaluation**

…the message sent by the existing evaluation system is not one which reinforces the importance of local management concerns. The message is rather one in which the donor agency’s agenda dominates the evaluation process, leaving little room for involvement and the improvement of future project and policy plans by local institutions and actors. (Snyder and Doan, 1995: 149)

Evaluation is a political activity: although individual evaluators may attempt to adopt an objective stance, the programs or projects they review are supported (or not supported as the case may be) by multiple stakeholders - individuals/agencies/organizations - with their own unique (and often contending) interests and perspectives (Palumbo, 1987). Since any decision made regarding the nature of project or programming efforts is likely to have an impact on each of the stakeholders it is, therefore, in each of their interest to seek to influence the process of evaluation for their own ends. Questions that need to be negotiated by stakeholders include such basic ones as: Should an
evaluation be conducted? What should be the focus of the evaluation (e.g., effectiveness, sustainability of activities, impact)? What methodology should be used? It is in this context that participation in, or ownership over, the evaluation process becomes crucial: evaluation is a source of power to those who control the system and a threat to organizations or groups that do not retain this control (Valadez and Bamberger, 1994).

Given the importance attached to ownership over the process it is crucial to note that aid evaluation has been characterized by a low level of involvement of recipient institutions; many institutions in the South have been the subjects of evaluation rather than the clients (or users) of evaluation. Indeed, donor agencies largely dominate the process of selection, finance, design, implementation and use of monitoring and evaluation with respect to development activities in the South (Bamberger, 1991).

Given their control over the process, it is not surprising that donors use evaluation to meet their own needs and not those of the recipient institutions. Their influence is reflected in the role that monitoring and evaluation has played in the donor-recipient relationship, the kinds of evaluations conducted and by whom, and the questions asked within these evaluations. Evaluation has traditionally served as a compliance or policing mechanism for donors. Donors are typically concerned with issues of accountability - whether their investments have been used efficiently and effectively. The evaluations conducted tend to reflect this narrow perspective and focus on the primary interests of the donor - those programs or projects which it funds - and not on the institutions as a whole, or on the issues the institution and its actors would identify as the most important for sustainability of that institution. In this way, instead of being set independently by the recipient institution, its research agenda can end up being driven by donor priorities. As such, recipients generally perceive evaluations as a threat geared towards a determination by a donor of whether or not to continue funding: while the donor views it as project funding - one part of a much larger stream of funding - the support may well be critical to the recipient's financial sustainability.

Frequently, evaluations are initiated and conducted on the ground by evaluators from the North often with little or no involvement of managers from the recipient institutions. A recent study by Snyder and Doan (1995) highlights this point. Reviewing a sample of 177 USAID mid-term and final project evaluations they found that implementing agency personnel participated in only one-quarter of them as team members. A number of reasons explain the low representation of indigenous personnel on evaluation teams: the absence of a systematic policy on the part of donors to include recipient personnel on evaluation teams; a lack of trained personnel within the recipient institutions with the background and expertise; donors' perceptions that recipient participation would undermine the objective nature of the evaluation; the requirement for donors to contract practitioners who understand their own information needs in the context of ever-changing home environments. One consequence of donor reliance on external Northern consultants is that recipient institutions miss out on crucial opportunities to strengthen their capacity to independently design and implement their own M & E activities. The use of Northern evaluators means that "much of the evaluation experience is acquired by and remains with those who are foreigners in the country where the programs and policies are rooted" (Snyder and Doan, 1995: 149). This creates a situation in which
donors assist research institutions to build their capacity to conduct meaningful research but do not assist them to the same degree to strengthen their ability to evaluate this research and improve management practices.

The experience of recipient organizations, therefore, has not been of a process which can assist them in strengthening their organization but rather of a process which threatens them with funding cuts or externally imposed changes to programming. Without in-house evaluation expertise, the institutions cannot approach working with a donor on an evaluation as an equal partner. Their role, as a result, becomes that of an entity reacting instead of guiding the process. In this role, their contribution to the evaluation in terms of design, stakeholder identification, etc. is diminished along with the value of the findings for their own management purposes. Indeed, because it is positioned as a policing mechanism not as a tool for organizational learning the actual generated benefits are limited; in its present incarnation M & E will tell us if project or program objectives have been met but will not tell us whether the activities in support of the objectives are actually going to enhance development: "Traditional evaluation generally takes place too far along in the process. is too focused on the activities or projects under investigation and is generally geared towards making judgments (as distinct from learning)" (Carden, 1996: 3).

Carden argues that if evaluation is going to serve as a learning function its role must shift from an exercise of power to the purpose of empowerment. Associated with this shift in evaluation's role is the need for the development or re-design of new methodologies because the issues explored and the questions asked are fundamentally different for each type of evaluation. Some movement has been made in this direction with the development of, for example, tools for institutional self-assessment,¹ but this remains a rich preserve open to further research. The next section reviews some of the literature drawn from business, evaluation and organizational theory to explore how evaluation, integrated into the research activities of development organizations, can contribute to institutional learning and strengthen recipients' capacity for management and planning.

II. Evaluation as a Tool for Management and Planning

A variety of environmental forces challenge and influence the manner with which development organizations conduct themselves. Some are external to the institution and not easily open to manipulation. Others are internal and, therefore, can be controlled to a greater degree. Given these environmental influences, strategic management is defined as "the task of producing a good fit between an organization's internal capacity and it external situation" (Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith, 1992).

Organizations that remain viable are those in which management continually monitors the external environment and takes stock of the organization's skills and resources and formulates

strategies to ensure the best fit between external threats and opportunities and internal strengths and weaknesses. Since every institution faces a unique environment there is no one optimum strategy. Moreover, because the internal and external environments are never in equilibrium, but are in a constant state of flux, institutions must continuously reexamine their environments over time and modify their corresponding strategies to produce the right fit.

In this context learning is crucial for the long-term health and survival of a development organization. Just like firms in the private sector, development organizations must keep apprised of developments in the market for their products - only by continually monitoring and reflecting on what stakeholders value and how to provide these goods and services efficiently, will they be able to adjust their activities accordingly. As Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith (1992) note "Environmental monitoring and internal self-corrections are thus often a sine qua non of institutional sustainability."

But how can an organization learn and how does evaluation fit within this process? Stated simply, "Organizational learning...means changes in what the organization knows and how it acts" (Fross et al., 1994: 575). Argyris and Schon (1978), two leading voices in organizational development theory, define organizational learning as a "process of detecting and correcting error" where "correcting error" is given as shorthand for a complex learning cycle in which organizations adjust to external and internal forces. Within this problem solving process they identify two types of organizational learning: single and double loop.

Single loop learning occurs when individuals within an organization detect an error and take action(s) to correct it. Argyris (1994) likens this type of error detection/correction to the functioning of a thermostat which measures ambient temperature against a standard setting and turns the heat source on or off accordingly. Double loop learning takes the additional steps of looking beyond the objective facts (in the case of the thermostat, the temperature) and examines the reasons and motives behind the facts. Using the example of the thermostat again, double loop learning would require questioning why the current temperature setting was chosen, whether it was the best temperature at which to heat the room, and whether the currently used heat source was the most effective available. Double-loop learning, therefore, encourages people to engage in organizational self-examination, to asks hard questions regarding their activities or behaviour and in so doing bring to light the kind of potentially threatening or embarrassing information that can produce real change.

Evaluation as one possible feedback mechanism available to an organization, can help generate insight into organizational behaviour and in so doing contribute to learning. Evaluation can assist a research development organization to determine if its projects and programs are meeting their objectives effectively and efficiently (single loop learning); or it can be used to test the basic assumptions underpinning and guiding its policies and practices to determine whether these are the right ones given changing circumstances (double-loop learning).
Formalizing Organizational Learning

The development towards openness to change and innovation, which is essential in organizational learning, can be sustained by a long-term belief in the necessity of change (Leeuw et al., 1995: 6).

Organizational learning does not happen automatically. Indeed, it often occurs in an ad hoc or informal fashion instead of being the result of deliberate practice. Moreover, when organizational learning does unfold it is more than likely to be of the single-loop variety (Argyris, 1994). Indeed, Argyris suggests that double-loop learning rarely occurs not because employees run away from this kind of organizational self-examination, but because no one asks it of them. It is in this respect that Argyris and Schon identify a third level of organizational learning. They postulate that organizations also have the capacity to "learn how to learn" (Argyris and Schon, 1978). Instead of having organizational learning unfold as an isolated and episodic event, organizational mechanisms are put in place that allow them to systematically learn from their experiences - organizational learning becomes part of an ongoing process of organizational renewal.

In the last decade, business theorists have used the complex process of organizational learning modelled by Argyris and Schon as a foundation upon which to develop their ideas regarding the concept of the "learning organization" (Kline and Saunders, 1995; Marquardt and Reynolds, 1994; Senge, 1990). Instead of trying to map the processes by which organizations learn, as Argyris and Schon did, these writers are more interested in identifying structures, mechanisms and practices that contribute to the creation of a learning culture, one that gives organizations the ability to learn how to learn. They argue that an organization's ability to adapt and adjust to external and internal forces is dependent on its capacity to learn. This capacity should be part of the organizational culture, integrated with and embedded in the way people work; rather than having learning unfold in an infrequent, and isolated manner as is traditionally the case; a learning organization should offer employees continuous opportunities to "translate new knowledge into new ways of behaving" by actively managing the learning process "to ensure that it occurs by design rather than by chance" (Garvin, 1993).

The learning organization concept, therefore, demands a commitment by an organization to put in place practices that contribute to the creation of a learning culture. Although much of the literature does not explicitly identify a role for evaluation many of the suggested practices overlap space already occupied by evaluation. For instance, according to Garvin (1993) learning organizations are skilled at five main activities: systematic problem solving, experimentation with new approaches, learning from their own experiences and past history, learning from the experiences and best practices of others, and transferring knowledge quickly and efficiently throughout the organization.

Recent work by the World Conservation Union (IUCN, 1996) also offers some insights into the characteristics of development institutions which learn while they act - what they call a
"reflective institution." What is noteworthy about this research is the explicit positioning of monitoring and evaluation within the reflective institution's activities: "monitoring and evaluation of activities and projects is not so much a discrete task as a way of thinking which permeates the structures and practices of an institution" (IUCN, 1996).

This view of the role of evaluation has implications for the way evaluation activities are practised. It suggests that the responsibility for and practice of evaluation be decentralized. Evaluation expertise need not reside in one unit or branch of an organization but should be shared and internalized with the organization as a whole. It also points to the need for a relatively high-level of sophistication and understanding of evaluation practice on the part of employees and by extension the need for the development of staff expertise through training. Moreover, to support continuous learning, evaluation needs to be transformed from its role as a one-shot exercise, occurring mid-way through or at the end of a project, and instead be part of a cyclical process in which employees meet to jointly identify and analyze problems, generate, select and implement potential solutions, monitor results, reflect critically on the process, and use the resultant information to reframe the problem and try out a new solution (Marsick, 1987). Finally, the role of evaluation has to shift its current role of inspection and judgement, to one that embraces error as part of the learning process.

Development institutions are exposed to ever-changing external and internal environment. Without the capacity to monitor and react to environmental changes, their long-term sustainability remains in question. Evaluation, as a form of reflection and learning, can serve to keep organizations abreast of these changes. It is not the only method for collecting information and data to inform strategic management and planning but it can contribute strongly to organizational learning process. Its contribution can be even greater if it is integrated into activities that promote the development of a "learning organization."

From the discussion thus far, it is apparent that the model of organizational learning is far different from the reality as it currently exists in the development assistance arena. Evaluation remains to a large degree donor-driven and the absence of recipient ownership means that the benefits of M & E are often not shared equally between donors and recipients. Building an internal capacity for evaluation is critical to the use of evaluation as a learning and planning tool. The next section reviews some donors' efforts to strengthen the capacity of development organizations to design and implement their own M & E activities with particular attention paid to the experiences of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

III. Strengthening the Capacity of Recipient Institutions - IDRC's Experience

IDRC was created by an Act of the Parliament of Canada with the mandate to create, maintain, and enhance research capacity in developing countries in response to needs determined by the people in those countries. It mission is "empowerment through knowledge" - research is viewed as a means for acquiring knowledge and, hence, for development. "The capacity to conduct research, therefore, is seen as a necessary condition for empowerment." (IDRC, 1993) It achieves
this mission by funding research projects designed and managed by individual scientists working in Southern institutions.

The evaluation function in IDRC was established in 1980 as part of the Office of Planning and Evaluation; the Evaluation Unit was subsequently created in 1991 within IDRC's Corporate Services Branch. Over the years IDRC has positioned its Evaluation Unit to meet the growing demand for strengthened evaluation systems both in-house and in recipient institutions. This response was predicated on a number of fundamental principles regarding the role of evaluation at IDRC including: a) the perception that the evaluation process itself is a powerful research tool that can be used to improve scientific and operational management for IDRC and their collaborators in the South; b) research capacity building must incorporate capacity-building for evaluation, since it is fundamental to the selection of research priorities, sound research design, and good research management; c) the most effective evaluations are conducted with the participation of those responsible for the project or program under evaluation as well as its intended beneficiaries (Love, 1996).

In line with these principles, the Evaluation Unit has supported a number of projects with the goal of empowering recipients to conduct their own M & E activities. Three projects from the years 1992 to 1996 are analyzed here. A common feature of all was the integration of evaluation directly into projects at the design stage. The intent was to give research teams the opportunity to use evaluation as a management tool ensuring more effective implementation, and enabling better measurement of project impact. The types of M & E activities are described and the factors contributing to the success or failure of the evaluation component are explored to lend insight into the obstacles and opportunities (at least from the donor perspective) of supporting such efforts.

**Evaluation Capacity Building at IDRC - Background**

This section highlights several examples of IDRC's Evaluation Unit experiences in bolstering institutional evaluation capacity. Two of the projects focused on building the evaluation capacity of research organizations unified within newly formed inter- and intra-regional networks. As such, overall management of the evaluation effort was undertaken by the respective network coordinators with technical assistance and guidance provided by the Evaluation Unit and external consultants. Evaluation activities were directed at improving the ability of network partner organizations to better design and manage their projects. The evaluation capacity of research teams from each node was to be strengthened so that they could independently sustain M & E activities throughout the life-cycle of their individual research efforts.

The third project attempted to install an evaluation regime for an established association of research organizations. The evaluation activities in this project differed from the other two in that they were aimed at strengthening the capacity for evaluation at the association level and not in the individual research organizations that the association supported. Consequently, evaluation activities were directed at measuring the performance of programs and not individual projects.
The three projects were characterized by extensive multi-donor funding arrangements with IDRC contributing approximately 2.8 million dollars (CAD) and other donors putting forward over 5.1 million dollars. In all three project evaluation capacity building activities formed one component of a larger set of project activities; funding budgeted for evaluation ranged between $50,000 and $150,000 per project.

Evaluation consultants were employed as the primary mechanism for building capacity. On each project they cooperated with senior members of the project team (e.g. network coordinators) to provide the project participants with information and expertise, thus fostering awareness and understanding of M & E and strengthening capacity through the acquisition of appropriate skills and knowledge. Workshops were used as the main vehicle to introduce the latest tools and methods for evaluation. For instance, at one workshop, participants were introduced to the “principles and processes of evaluation as a management tool.” They were taught the basics of what evaluation was, why it was used and how it could be used effectively by managers. On another project, a workshop introduced practical methods for developing an evaluation framework to guide the use of indicators for data collection and analysis.

Other strategies for strengthening capacity included providing project teams with assistance in developing evaluation frameworks (sometimes consultants actually formulated the frameworks, at other times they simply provided advice and guidance). As well, consultants developed M & E guidebooks to be distributed to project participants that provided easy-to-follow methods for implementing M & E activities; participated in project planning sessions to lend M & E guidance; and, wrote a series of articles that appeared in project newsletters.

The rationale for this approach to evaluation which empowers research organizations to undertake their own M & E activities is of course to strengthen research management decision-making. Integrating evaluation at the beginning of the project cycle improves the quantity and quality of information available to managers and researchers and hence, improves their ability to make informed decisions. A number of other considerations also drove this approach. On one project at least, the extended use of participatory evaluation methods was envisioned as a mechanism by which research teams could promote community participation and foster community understanding and ownership of the project activities. On another project, it was hoped that the M & E information generated by the project would help promote the sustainability of research efforts by securing continued donor support as well as attracting the interest of other donors. Through regular progress updates to current and potential donors, project participants could cement the credibility of their respective organizations by demonstrating relatively early in the project cycle that activities were advancing as planned, and thereby leverage funding for future efforts.

Guiding Principles and Rationale
Although each project examined disparate research development issues, in broad terms the guiding principles underpinning the integration of M & E were similar. The activities were designed
A unifying theme of all three projects was the emphasis placed on the continuous flow of evaluation activities: evaluation activities were designed to commence at the project's outset and continue for the duration. This continuous process was perceived to hold a number of advantages. Incorporated during the design phase, M & E activities could help detect design flaws. By designing evaluation studies from the start, it was also possible to introduce evaluation issues into the specifications that are given for progress and monitoring reports; consequently, answers to evaluation questions could be answered for the duration of the project rather than waiting for more formal mid-term review or ex-post evaluation. This process, therefore, introduces an ongoing review and appraisal process that permits scientists and research managers to be aware of problems as they occur and to make changes as required rather than wait until the project is completed.

M & E activities were to be integrated rather than grafted on to the overall program of work. Participants were to view M & E as one of their day-to-day responsibilities. For instance, where appropriate M & E activities were to be integrated into existing data collection and project/program review and reporting mechanisms. The goal was to get better, not more, information. As such, it was hoped that M & E would not be viewed as an additional burden.

As much as possible the M & E activities were to adopt a participatory methodology and hence be completely transparent. M & E was not to be undertaken by a group of experts "parachuted" into the project. Instead the evaluation activities were to be highly interactive, with project participants sharing in the design, conduct and reporting of evaluation. Project participants had to "buy-in" to the M & E process and be prepared not only to contribute to planning but also take responsibility for implementation.

M & E should promoted as and must deliver something from which project participants will receive tangible benefits.

M & E activities were presented as a learning exercise and not as an external examination or as a method to measure inputs. Monitoring and evaluation were to be inclusive and open so that people could recognize, accept and learn from mistakes — and not be judged harshly for any errors.

Factors Inhibiting the Long-term Implementation / Institutionalization of M & E

The main objective of the Evaluation Unit in the three projects was to empower the collaborating research organizations to undertake M & E activities for their own advantage and benefit. The efforts to integrate an evaluation component at the beginning of the project cycle was a new experience for both the collaborating institutions as well as IDRC and, hence, serves as fertile ground from which to gather lessons regarding methods for improving implementation and
sustainability of these efforts. Commonly, the projects began with participants embracing the M & E concepts, but as the projects progressed the role of M & E was increasingly marginalized. Four factors explain why participants never became fully engaged in the process:

1. Ownership

The issue of ownership over the research process is critical. In a recent survey of former IDRC project leaders (Salewicz & Dwivedi, 1996), a number of those interviewed endorsed IDRC's approach to project management in which researchers are given the opportunity to assume independent responsibility and leadership of a project. With control over the design and implementation of activities in their hands, they were more likely to have a vested interest in the final product - the success or failure was directly linked to their efforts.

A review of the cases presented here, suggests that for the evaluation component of each project, at least, there was a perception among some collaborating institutions that M & E activities remained donor-driven and as a result recipients were reluctant "buy-in" or commit to the process. Typically, researchers working in institutions in the South approach IDRC for funding on project ideas they have generated in-house. They submit a proposal and the role of IDRC project staff is to assist them to refine their approach if necessary. Changes to project design tend to be part of a negotiated process between the two parties. In the three project reviewed here, the main impetus for the inclusion of an evaluation component came from IDRC and was not generated by the recipient institutions themselves. As a result, IDRC was perceived as driving an externally imposed process and that the institutions were passive participants. Researchers and managers felt that they were being "forced" to adopt monitoring and evaluation methodologies. The fact that acceptance of the evaluation component was tied to project funding likely influenced the decision of the recipients to initially accept and implement the evaluation activities. They continued their support (on paper at least) for the proposed activities, however, in practice delayed or avoided implementation.

Ownership was also circumscribed in part by the manner in which the evaluation activities were organized and implemented. Overall, responsibility for IDRC project implementation is in the hands of the individual researchers working for recipient institutions. On these three projects, external consultants were employed as the primary mechanism for building capacity; they also directed the development of the evaluation frameworks. This created the perception that responsibility for evaluation was out of the hands of the recipient institutions and that external actors were driving the design of their research program. The language used by consultants reinforced this impression. One consultant wrote in a note to IDRC that "in my opinion, any institution that receives a small grant...must also agree to an evaluation component - and by agree I mean they must be willing to devote time and effort to it..."³

³ Emphasis added.
2. Local Capacity:

Capacity at the recipients institution and researcher level is another factor critical to the successful implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities. Using evaluation for organizational learning requires a relatively high level of understanding and expertise on the part of those required to employ the tools and methods - in this case researchers. Research teams, however, never possessed and indeed, never gained a critical mass of knowledge and skills to independently incorporate M & E into their projects. Consequently, it was difficult for some participants to embrace and value the evaluation components simply because they did not fully comprehend the concepts underpinning the process.

Evaluation consultants were the primary source of technical expertise. Their role was to jump-start the process by provide advice and guidance and educating researchers on appropriate tools and methods. Of the six consultants retained, only one was from the region in which the activities were being implemented. With the main proponents of the M & E effort absent from the scene for long periods, evaluation support was not readily supplied. Having long-distance evaluation advisors as the only source of M & E support, therefore, proved insufficient.

At the same time, workshop presentations and exercises were used as the main vehicle by consultants to introduce the latest tools and methods for evaluation. The training audience usually consisted of scientists who were expected to use the methods to integrate M & E activities into their own projects. Workshops were offered early in the project cycle. Although this approach is useful for fostering a general understanding of M & E among research teams the activities never built a core of evaluation expertise to occupy the M & E leadership vacuum once support from external evaluation consultants ended.

3. Political Will

Another factor influencing the successful implementation of the M & E components of these projects was the level of support the initiative received from project leaders. Support for implementation, as noted by Najam (1995) is largely conditional upon clients' - in this case the network and association coordinators - perceptions of whether their interests are enhanced or threatened by successful implementation. Depending on their calculations regarding costs and benefits of support they will employ strategies either to strengthen or deflect implementation - “clients can speed, slow, stop or redirect implementation”.

It seems apparent from reading through the case files that in at least two of the projects, senior project team members felt threatened by the integration of M & E into their projects. They refused to fully embrace the notion of using evaluation as a learning tool and instead continued to act in a defensive manner believing that M & E activities were being carried out not for their benefit but were being used by IDRC as a type of policing mechanism.

Management also perceived the process as burdensome, one that took much time and resources to implement but did not add-value to their activities in the short-term. As researchers they
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Abstract:

This paper explores issues in the evaluation of research through an examination of the situation in the field of international development. It is increasingly recognized that traditional evaluation, which served largely a policing function, is not useful in assessing the impact of the development research process. It is argued that the role and perception of evaluation must change if it is to provide a reflection of the learning which takes place in research. The field of international development research provides a rich ground in which to explore the argument. The field is subject to the difficulties of evaluating research and to the difficulties of evaluating development -- in both cases, we are dealing with long time frames and the influence of many factors other than the activity itself. If evaluation is to serve a learning function, then the shift must be to a purpose of empowerment. This paper explores the changes which are implicit in such a shift through an examination of three key areas: changing perspectives on evaluation; changing patterns in development; and changing patterns in research for development.
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This paper explores issues in the evaluation of research. It is argued that the role and perception of evaluation must change if it is to provide a reflection of the learning which takes place in research. While the role of evaluation is beginning to be questioned, in response to new demands being placed on evaluation groups for 'performance-based measurement', 'value-for-money' and 'output-oriented evaluation', if we do not clarify the context within which evaluation is taking place, then we can only move in the direction of increasingly audit-oriented approaches to evaluation -- in North America, this is evidenced in the increasing involvement of audit professionals in the development and use of systems for performance-based measurement, in which audit is looking not only at process and procedure but also at output.

The field of international development research provides a rich ground in which to explore the argument. The field is subject to the difficulties of evaluating research and to the difficulties of evaluating development -- in both cases, we are dealing with long time frames and the influence of many factors other than the activity itself: indeed in development, the whole purpose is to create other influences, to have an impact on a range of decision processes and the capacities for management and decision-making. Thus, in both research and development, the identification of the relationship of impact, performance and results with a specific project is extremely difficult to assess in other than the narrowest sense.

For these reasons, it is increasingly recognized that traditional evaluation, which served largely a policing function, is not useful in assessing the impact of the development research process. Traditional evaluation continues to play a role in assisting with the determination of whether or not the objectives of a specific research for development activity have been met. What it cannot do, is inform us as to whether or not that activity
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The field of international development research provides a rich ground in which to explore the argument. The field is subject to the difficulties of evaluating research and the difficulties of evaluating development -- in both cases, we are dealing with long time frames and the influence of many factors other than the activity itself: indeed in development, the whole purpose is to create other influences, to have an impact on a range of decision processes and the capacities for management and decision-making. Thus, in both research and development, the identification of the relationship of impact, performance and results with a specific project is extremely difficult to assess in other than the narrowest sense.

For these reasons, it is increasingly recognized that traditional evaluation, which served largely a policing function, is not useful in assessing the impact of the development research process. Traditional evaluation continues to play a role in assisting with the determination of whether or not the objectives of a specific research for development activity have been met. What it cannot do, is inform us as to whether or not that activity
is going to enhance development. Traditional evaluation generally takes place too far along in the process, is too focussed on the activities or projects under investigation and is generally geared towards making judgements (as distinct from extracting learning). The analysis changes when the purpose of evaluation changes, from the exercise of power. If evaluation is to serve a learning function, then the shift must be to a purpose of empowerment. This paper explores the changes which are implicit in such a shift.

While there have been a number of new tools introduced in evaluation in the past two decades, there has been very little change in the fundamental principles underlying evaluation. Evaluation is based on the premise that people will make decisions based on information, if they have it; evaluation sets out to provide it. Because of this, the audience for the evaluation is crucial. The same issue will be explored differently with different audiences and will result in different arguments. The context is crucial. In addition, the relationship between information and decision is not a direct one, particularly in research and development. Precise analysis is not possible as the causal linkages cannot be clearly identified.

At the same time, there are increasing demands in the development research community to ensure that the research which is carried out is relevant to the needs of the communities involved. This pressure is coming from funding sources; it is coming from national governments; and it is coming from researchers themselves. The funders of research can bring the most direct pressure to bear, and their needs for accountability have the most immediate impact on the role and function of evaluation in research. In times of declining resources, the evaluation function is seen as increasingly relevant and important. But it is not clear that it plays a significant role in the decision process; therefore its long term viability and relevance is questioned.
"The evaluator must engage his audience in a dialogue in which they are free to employ their reasoning. This means that the audiences must assume personal responsibility for their interpretation of the evaluation since the reasoning presented to them is neither completely convincing nor entirely arbitrary. This means that the evaluator must also assume personal responsibility for his judgments since he cannot hide behind blind method. Both must exercise their natural reason."\(^3\)

This paper explores the changing context within which evaluation of research is taking place, and outlines the factors which are changing which most affect the research evaluation function. What it attempts to do is outline the issues which need to be considered. It does not provide an answer as there will be different answers in different contexts and for different types of research or organizations.

Evaluation as learning

"Evaluations can be no more than acts of persuasion... Subjected to serious scrutiny, evaluations always appear equivocal"\(^4\)

The objective is to shift the use of evaluation from power to empowerment. In order to achieve that objective it is essential to develop a better understanding of the context in which evaluation is taking place and to be able to build a better argument for the role of evaluation as reflection on research.

The context is defined here in terms of three key issues. Questions and issues emerge from these issues which are considered in the framework of a revised perspective on the role and function of evaluation. The three key issues are:
- changing perspectives on evaluation
- changing patterns in development
- changing patterns in research for development

1. Changing perspectives in evaluation

"In rendering evaluation problematic we open the way to choice."\(^5\)

It has become accepted in an environment of rapid organizational change, that evaluation should be empowering, that evaluation is intended to enhance learning in an organization and to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. It is also a tool for adaptation and organizational survival. It is argued in many organizations that evaluation is part of the planning and management system of the organization and that it has a key role to play in what and how we learn, in building corporate memory and in changing what we do and how we operate. It is indispensable in times of crisis and change as a mechanism to help see us through that uncertainty. Evaluation has been able to create that position for itself for two reasons: it is seen as certain in a time of uncertainty (even though evaluation is based on argumentation;) and it is able to contribute to learning and change in a clear and unequivocal way, separate from the substantive work of the organization: that is, it does not appear to have a stake in sustaining or maintaining any particular dimension of the substantive work, but can recommend elimination of a product or expansion of another product without any particular impact on itself. This has aspects of empowerment which are appealing as well as helpful within an uncertain structure.

This is a significant change in perspective, although there has not been a concomitant change in method. The change in perspective is from evaluation as error identifying and as decision making alibi, to evaluation as error embracing and as a learning tool.
The example of the International Development Research Centre - Canada (IDRC), illustrates the shift to this perspective. It is summarized in its strategy as "Empowerment Through Knowledge," based on the principle that knowledge, and the capacity to use knowledge, empowers people to make decisions about their own futures: "The capacity to conduct research is... a necessary condition for empowerment." This has significant implications in terms of evaluation. As noted by Morgan, when we talk about research in relation to the empowerment of individuals, groups, and classes, we explicitly recognize that research has an ideological dimension. Hence we are invited to evaluate how different research strategies may favour and advance different interests, either because of their intrinsic nature or because of the way in which they are used. We are invited to see that research, inevitably, has an ethical, moral and political aspect that is relevant in the evaluation of all research.

Performance-based measurement and similar measures called for in today's evaluation environment, reflect the tension between evaluation as a learning tool and evaluation as a decision alibi. Performance-based measurement emerges essentially from a need for additional decision alibi, not from a need for expressing and using evaluation as a learning tool. As systems reduce expenditures and consequently reduce programs, there is a need for a rationale for cutting programs and for making choices. Because of the short time-frames which are usually placed on these decisions, it is not in fact possible for the information and evaluation systems to be built and decisions to be taken; rather the performance measurement system is applied against projects and programs which did not get put in place under these conditions; when conditions are applied after the fact, there is much speculation and many assumptions; this speculation and these assumptions are guided largely by current socio-economic and political environments, rather than an ability to determine ex-poste the performance measurements which are most appropriate in each case.

The paucity of new tools for evaluation means that we are attempting to move to a
learning approach with methods designed to serve the needs and purposes of evaluation as a decision alibi. Without the development of new tools (or perhaps the re-generation and re-design of old tools and methods) it is impossible to serve both the performance measurement needs and the learning needs with any one evaluation. Evaluations will tend either to serve a performance measurement need or to serve a learning need; the two will remain mutually exclusive in a world of tools which do not address the two distinct frames of reference.

2. Changing patterns in development

The second dimension to the changing environment is focussed on a changing pattern of relationships and new recognitions in the field of international development. It has long been recognized in many quarters that international development has been in need of new approaches and new theory. Development theory is moribund and is not providing us with any useful guidance in efforts by NGOs, government, international donor agencies, individuals or the private sector, in enhancing development in the South or in improving relationships between North and South. The field has replaced theoretical advancement with semantic argument as to the relative merits of less developed, underdeveloped, less industrial, newly industrialized, the South - and their opposites for the wealthy countries. What remains after the debate is that poor countries are increasingly and relatively poorer than rich countries, the gap is widening, and there is no evidence that new approaches to date are making any significant difference. This is a somewhat simplified presentation of the situation, but the situation remain the same, no matter what the couching.

Three dimensions of the development problématique which are particularly relevant to the changing field of evaluation are the following: there is a growing recognition of the need for participation and engagement if development is to be successful. In the development community, we are not entirely sure what we mean by that; it is
approached in many different ways, but it is recognized in most quarters that if those who are the "subjects" of development do not have ownership of the approaches to changing their situation, then the approaches will not succeed. Approaches to participation have emerged largely out of the NGO community which was early to recognize this gap and which was early to develop a variety of tools and methods to engage people in the development process. What has been missing is engagement of the full range of interests - to engage villagers is often counterproductive if their governments are not engaged; the villagers will come up against a brick wall when they least expect it in creating the change they have articulated for themselves; they have developed some confidence in their local knowledge and some confidence in their ability to come up with solutions, only to have these summarily rejected by decision makers - who have not participated. In the development debate we have thus far neglected entire strands of social science thinking which have been built on participation, notably the argumentation method, a method which requires the engagement of the interests in the definition of the questions to be addressed and the solutions to be considered. Therefore the need for a growing demand for results-based management. This has been mentioned elsewhere but it has a particular relevance in the development community because of the declining resources available for development action and the pressures which are brought to bear on the actors to demonstrate that the development work in which they are engaged in producing results and should continue to be funded. Because our methods are largely based on the approach of evaluation as decision aid, when we are asked to demonstrate results, we tend to link audit and evaluation more closely than before, we tend to quantitative measures of what we have attempted, and we tend to try to identify the immediate results, even though development is perceived as a long term process. It is particularly important on this point to note that we look to the immediate results of the current work in development, rather than looking at the results over the long term of work in which
We are no longer engaged, either because it is no longer the fashion in development or because it is a domain which has been more closely integrated into the direct responsibilities of recipient governments so that the development community no longer plays a role. Looking to the results from this investment made in the past is not normally considered; in part this is a political response: how do you make the case for the work you are doing now based on results of different work you are no longer doing? In part, it is a methodological gap: we do not have the tools and methods to assess impact in this way.

On a more positive note, one of the key aspects which has emerged as a result of this shift in demand and expectation is that more projects and programs are much more careful in articulating objectives and anticipated outputs in a more realistic and thoughtful manner. They are recognizing that they have to be able to defend what they are doing; and as a result are more thoughtful in the design process. The risk of course is that priorities - and therefore evaluation criteria - change by the time the evaluation of outcome or impact is appropriate.

The third (and for evaluation, the most interesting) dimension of the shift in development thinking, is the recognition of weaknesses in assessing development. This has its roots in a growing sense in development that we do not know what we are doing. We have focussed on the project and the program to the exclusion of questioning the overall development of systems. Successful projects have somehow not lead to changes in patterns of development. Suitable mechanisms for assessing development systems have not been in place.

The world is in a crisis of unsustainability: not achieving wellbeing for all people, yet degrading and destroying the ecosystem... A constant tension exists between the needs of people and the ecosystem... No-one knows what these combinations of wellbeing are or how to achieve them. Progress depends on our recognizing our ignorance and uncertainty, and
and acting on their situation.  

We are not clear on what we are assessing, nor for what purposes - because we are not clear on what development, particularly sustainable development, looks like. It is therefore extremely difficult to come up with sensible methods and tools for determining if we are making progress, if we are improving the livelihood of people and not destroying the ecosystem. As indicated in the above quote from a research project to explore this question, the key issue is to ask questions, to explore what we mean by development and for whom.

3. Changing patterns in research for development

"In engaging in research, the researcher engages in an activity that inevitably has human consequences of many kinds. It would thus seem that the researcher should be aware of these and attempt to bring them to bear on the selection of research strategies and in understanding the consequences of their use. In doing so, it becomes possible to move toward an approach to the conduct and evaluation of research that is characterized by a continuous process of reflective exploration, rather than by a quest for a certain basis for knowledge as is now often the case." 

The third key issue is the changing pattern of research in development. Three dimensions of this issue are explored below. The first is the increasing sophistication of the global research community. In a recent study by the Evaluation Unit of the International Development Research Centre, it was found that the Centre (which supports the development of research capacity in the South, as well as supporting research for development) is working with increasingly older and more
presence of a larger number of researchers, with more academic training and more research experience. As such the selection and design of research is much more in the domain of the researchers in the South than in the purview of the Centre's research professionals; and increasingly complex projects may be undertaken. The challenge now is to ensure input of these scientists into the design of programs and priorities funded by international agencies.

The second dimension is the increasing recognition of the need for evaluation in research and recognition of the need for effective methodologies. This is a response to the pressures faced by the research communities to demonstrate the value and relevance of the research which is being conducted. This recognition is guided by an awareness that for evaluation to be effective, there must be some ownership of the results of the evaluation by those who can respond to the results of the evaluation. Taking and giving ownership of the results to the key interest groups is achieved partly by participation in building consensus on both what is important and how it should be evaluated. As noted by Montigny,

"Consensus is rare, takes time to achieve and is hard to maintain. Yet only consensus has any real prescriptive force, because its effectiveness is contingent upon the consent of all parties... Consequently the only objective for evaluation... is to achieve this consensus, even if the latter is essentially provisional. That is the price that must be paid for effective evaluation."14

Even where consensus is not achieved, this reflects a "user-driven" approach to evaluation.15 If the users are driving the evaluation the results are going to be more meaningful to them. In that case, even where consensus is not achieved, some part of the user community may well find a part of the results meaningful, and may make use of those results.
The third dimension is an *increasing awareness of the need for clarity of purpose and objectives*. This was raised in the last section, but bears repeating in the research context. It is related to the issue raised above, the shift to results-based management. In its early stages, development researchers made the case that development was a long term process and so the research should not be judged on the short term results. Now, the long term has come: concerted efforts towards development in the South have been ongoing for some thirty years. While there have been many success stories (notably in countries where development assistance and support has been a relatively small percentage of GNP,\(^{12}\)) there are many more cases where the long term has come with little evidence of positive results. This places an increasing burden of proof on those carrying out development work and development research to demonstrate that what they are doing is effective and is contributing in a positive manner. In order to be able to more clearly demonstrate what is being achieved, clarity about what is intended is critical; otherwise it is extremely difficult to claim credit and very easy to be saddled with blame for what has not happened to improve the situation.

Identifying objectives for a development research project becomes much more important: smaller steps which can be measured and in which progress can be demonstrated, are crucial to longer term viability of funding and support - financial, political and intellectual.

Conclusions

"Evaluated argument is at once less certain, more particularized, more personalized, and more conducive to action than is research information."

House p.6

Evaluation has the potential to support the dissemination and implementation of research results. Whether one views it as empirical study or argumentative study, the
purpose is to put forward the value of a piece of research and to demonstrate why (or why not) a study should be implemented, what benefits it will provide and what development should ensue. An evaluation can present a demonstration of the research findings and can argue the case for renewed funding. It has to be more accessible than the research itself because it has to make the findings understandable to research managers and to funding sources. It also has to be defined clearly with the needs of users of the research in mind. From the initiation of a plan to evaluation a research activity, the involvement of the users, or clients, plays a crucial role:

Perhaps the most important agreements peculiar to a particular evaluation are those derived from the negotiation that often precedes the evaluation - agreements between sponsors, program personnel, and evaluators. In this exceedingly important negotiation, agreement can be reached on criteria, methods and procedures, access, dissemination of results and so on. Disagreement on these points can destroy the entire credibility of the evaluation.17

It is this latter perspective on evaluation, that it is the interpretation of the relevance of the research findings, which is crucial to an appreciation of the role evaluation can play in supporting research. It demonstrates the relevance and interest of other parties in the research, demonstrates the ways in which the research may be used to support a development objective and demonstrates the opportunities which emerge from the findings. This is a learning perspective on the role of evaluation, as distinct from a decision perspective.

This approach to the role of evaluation is not limited to the practice of external evaluation. It may be an external role for evaluation, where experts are brought in to examine a program, in which case, the evaluator is responding to a request for an assessment by the managers, of the relevance of the research. It is equally relevant in a process of self-evaluation where the program participants themselves evaluate their
successes and failures. This is a situation in which the participants want to engage in a learning exercise themselves, so that they can better disseminate their findings, or so that they can determine what aspects of the research should be the primary focus. It is also relevant to a participatory evaluation exercise in which both the program participants and the funders (or program managers) play a role in determining the key issues to be addressed and the areas of critical importance to review.
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.House, ibid., p. 5


.Morgan, G., ibid., p. 400.

.Engagement is defined as “the process by which social scientists endeavor actively to relate themselves in relevant and meaningful ways to society,” (Eric Trist, in the Preface to “The social engagement of social science: a Tavistock anthology,” University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990: xi. In this context, one can think of the policy makers, evaluators and development theorists in particular.

.As outlined by House in the article cited earlier, argumentation is the interpretation of data in context; whereas both deductive and inductive reasoning are the search for certain knowledge. (House, ibid., p. 6)


.There is however, still a need for capacity building and for the development of stronger research communities. The expansion of the research community is not uniform
Requirement for Systematizing M&E

- Diana Lee-Smith
  Mazingira Institute, Nairobi, Kenya.

Introduction
In this paper I provide some background information for Session 7 of the workshop on Day 2 which will explore the requirements for systematizing monitoring and evaluation. The discussion will be based on participants' experiences and problems. This paper gives a brief overview of some of the issues with references and ideas about tools based on my own experience. The six sections of the paper address five questions:

What is evaluation?
Why there is resistance to evaluation
How evaluation can be useful
Who should evaluate?
How to create a learning organization
It concludes with some examples of training methods and tools.

What is evaluation?
Evaluation has been defined as:
the objective measurement of process and outcomes as a function of explicit treatments or interventions (Lawrence 1989).
Although this seems reasonably straightforward there are problems on how it is to be done in practice. In particular, it is doubtful whether evaluation can ever really be objective. It is claimed that evaluation is inherently political because it entails value judgements. For this and other reasons it conforms to none of the canons of social science, applied science or policy science (Palumbo 1987). Also, evaluation is dependent on the purpose to which it is put and the context in which it is carried out (Carden 1994).

The three broad purposes to which evaluation may be put are: policy formulation, policy execution, and accountability (Chelinsky quoted by Palumbo 1987). Clearly these purposes reflect the needs of different interest groups and will lead to data being used in different ways. There are so many definitions of evaluation that some scholars agree that it is whatever you want it to be (Patton 1982).
There is however a useful set of historical types or phases through which evaluation has gone (Bamberger 1991; Binnenduk 1959):

1. In the 1960s evaluation was geared to objective external criteria and methodological rigour. It emphasised performance criteria like rate of return. I shall discuss below what problems this led to.

2. In the 1970s evaluation was geared to management by objectives, with a broad range of objectives including basic needs of the poor and tools like LogFrame Analysis (LFA). Both these first two types can be called summative evaluations, which focus on performance assessment.

3. In the 1980s formative evaluation, sometimes called goal-free evaluation (Scriven) emerged. This focused on assessing the appropriateness of the objectives or direction of activities being evaluated, with the emphasis on learning and changing strategies and goals.

4. In the 1990s the stakeholder approach to evaluation gained ground, recognizing issues of bias, resolving conflicting views and the politics of evaluation because it is based on value judgement, context and perspective.

Evaluation may also be part of the management tool known as monitoring and evaluation or M&E. Rather than being two distinct activities, M&E are closely tied together as parts of a single process of collecting data and using it for evaluation. The two parts of this process are often described as a continuum (Senga/Ndeu 1976; Binnenduk 1989):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of information</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>inputs/outputs</td>
<td>results/impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementors</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management use</td>
<td>in-house</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project</td>
<td>policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected through monitoring can be used for short term feedback into management processes to check against performance targets as well as being further digested and compared in order to evaluate the achievement of broader policy goals or even to question those goals.

The essential nature of M&E is that it is built in from the start to the organization, program or project for which it provides a sensory system that makes better decisions possible. M&E acts as the guidance system for better and more effective management.


... Resistance to Evaluation

If evaluation is inherently political in nature it is hardly surprising that it should be resisted when people or agencies believe that it may threaten their interests. Where evaluation is being used for the purpose of accountability, as distinct from the purposes of policy formulation or policy execution, those involved in the program or agency being audited may fear that this is a policing activity carried out by hostile outsiders. It is arguable whether this is a fear caused by those people having something to hide or simply the rather common reaction of people disliking criticism and resenting others telling them what to do.

This reaction is often carried over to hostility to evaluation even when its purpose is policy formulation or policy execution, just because it is associated with a policing function in most people's minds. In aid recipient countries such a response is again hardly surprising since a review of the literature on aid evaluation shows that most such evaluations have been carried out without a second thought as performance audits for the use of donor countries and organizations alone (Cracknell 1988; Bamberger 1991).

Bamberger's analysis shows how, particularly in the earlier days of the 1960s and 70s, evaluation focussed on methodological rigour of social science surveys and rarely produced results that were useful to local decision makers. Even where there was an emphasis on local agencies doing M&E for policy purposes this was so. According to another study by Ahmed and Bamberger on monitoring and evaluation in South Asia, the experience was of organizational confusion, intimidation of line agencies, overcentralization, donor orientation, a focus on collecting data not usable results for policy, a failure to use the results anyway because the process was perceived as threatening, weaknesses in the data, an orientation to scientific method rather than usable data, and inadequate training in M&E.

My own experience with M&E of a large housing project in the 1970s in Kenya showed that insufficient attention was paid to building M&E into the decision making of the numerous organizations concerned, and that the donor organization itself failed to incorporate the findings into its policy and project development. The function of M&E was perceived as central government oversight by the local government implementing agency who tried to eject the consultants from their offices at first.

In this particular case, there were conflicting views between agencies and departments on what the purposes of the project, the evaluation, and each others' roles in implementation were. However, by the end of the exercise, they had achieved not only understanding but appreciation of each others' roles and a better working relationship. But this was not a conflict free process. As monitoring data on community groups' finances and operations began to come in, one local government employee locked up all her records...
and ran away. Data analysis revealed the community contributions were much higher in value than the money used for building.

Experience in the North shows that evaluation, being inherently political in incorporating multiple interests, may be resisted by many because it upsets the balance of power. Administrators may fear evaluations will reveal things that political opponents can use. Powerful people always want to set the evaluation agenda (Palumbo 1987).

**How evaluation can be useful**

The recent literature strongly advocates M&E as a management and not as a policing tool, to increase the consciousness of aid recipient organizations of their internal management processes and external environments so that they can perform in an effective and sustainable manner (Carden 1994; Lawrence 1989; Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith 1992). This is the way in which modern private and public sector organizations in the North use M&E in order to become more effective product or service delivery organizations and there is a growing body of knowledge on techniques developed for this purpose. This is reflected in the growing field of Human Resource Development (HRD) or Organizational Development (Argyris and Schon 1978; Garvin 1993; Argyris 1994; Preskill 1994).

Clearly evaluation is more useful to aid recipient organizations and organizations in the South in general when it is used as a management tool and loses its old association with policing or performance audit by outsiders. However, evaluation, or M&E, still has to become “error embracing” and overcome the natural resistance of people anywhere to admit mistakes and learn from them, which is what it is all about (Carden 1994).

Work in organizations is bound to be more effective when it is reflective. That is, if the people in the organizations continually think about whether their actions are contributing to the purpose for which the organization wants them to work and are not just habitual actions carried out thoughtlessly.

Too often organizations become ends in themselves, and the purposes for which people carry out tasks are geared to maintaining the status quo or are simply not questioned at all but done because a superior has ordered them done and the hierarchy must be maintained. Organizations have life cycles and usually the older an organization the more energy it spends on maintaining itself. Maintaining an organization so it doesn’t collapse is necessary, but so is vision. An organization needs to see where it is going so it does not walk off a metaphorical cliff or become a dead shell. This is where M&E can be useful.

A distinction is often drawn between summative (or performance) evaluation versus formative evaluation. This is the distinction between evaluating whether you have done what you said you would do versus reflecting on what you are doing and why.
A distinction is also made between single and double loop learning. Single loop learning relates to management by objectives. What is the organization / program / project supposed to be doing and is it doing it? What are the target outputs, did we meet the performance criteria we set? Like a thermostat, this type of M&E takes a reading and, if it finds the temperature is too low, it pumps in more heat, or if it is too high, it turns off the heat. This is negative feedback, which stabilizes a system within certain parameters. In organizational terms, this type of feedback delivers more of the same type of actions because it is assumed that the hypothesis is correct: that doing a prescribed action / strategy / project will produce some desired results.

Double loop learning relates to the observation that doing more of the same may produce the expected outputs but they have side effects or unintended consequences that mean wider purposes are not achieved. Namely, our hypothesis was wrong, the action did not produce the results we really wanted, or it did something else we didn't want to happen. This means it is necessary to review our objectives, change our strategy, restructure our organization.

Double loop learning uses second order feedback. The organization can change its direction. It can adjust to a changing, or even turbulent, environment. With double loop learning you develop the capacity to re-examine the organization and change it. It becomes a learning organization (Argyris and Schon 1978).

It is important that an organization has both double and single loop learning at its disposal if it is to act effectively. It is no use just detecting major errors and adjusting to them if the minor adjustments and delivery of performance feedback is missing. In cybernetic terms this is analogous to too much positive feedback -- like the howl of noise on a microphone. Too much positive or redirectioning feedback leads to gross overreactions. In the human nervous system there is a feedback disorder known as Parkinson's disease.

There are organizations that lash out with major restructurings that can be experienced as destructive spasms if first order feedback is not also maintained. That is, we must ask if the day-to-day life support systems are functioning. An example of such over reaction I can think of was the abolition of local authorities by the Tanzanian government in the 1970s because a "better" policy alternative was formulated with local services being delivered through grassroots based organizations that did not yet exist.

Who should evaluate?
In my experience self evaluation works well provided the institutional members share a vision and purpose. Establishing a common vision or purpose may be the first essential
step, as we have found in the IUCN project on how to assess progress towards sustainability (IUCN 1996a).

Self-evaluation may work best for an organization because the people inside the organization know most about it and can act intelligently with regard to its functioning. It is cheaper, quicker and makes best use of the available resources, mainly intelligence. Employees are good at M&E if they are not punished for acting intelligently.

This may be easier said than done however. Much of the recent work on Organizational Development still finds employee / manager relations persist, with employees depending on management to think for them and managers reinforcing this dependency (Argyris 1994). It is not always easy for organizations to reward independent action if this involves taking risks that may be costly. Employees seldom want to take such risks so they play safe within existing behaviour patterns even when they are not producing results (Garvin 1993).

And what can be done if there are other motivating factors that take precedence over improving the effectiveness of the organization in achieving its mission? For example people may want to keep their jobs, please their superiors, show loyalty to rules or principles, keep donor funds flowing, please politicians, maintain ethnic networks, keep control over slush funds, or just appropriate resources as in the case I mentioned above.

Corrupt institutions can't evaluate themselves usefully. Even if not corrupt, there are well known constraints against effective M&E internally if higher value is set on maintaining power structures or "good working relations" at the expense of error detection. Outside facilitation combined with training on M&E for insiders is usually an effective combination. An outside facilitator can often see constraints or opportunities that insiders have become habituated to. They can provide fresh insights. External evaluations can also have higher credibility than in-house exercises by ensuring transparency (Patton 1982).

The idea of M&E is to be responsive to internal functioning and the external environment of an organization: to see things as they are. The outside environment should be the test of the purpose and effectiveness of an organization (Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith 1992). If a self-evaluation method is set up that gets feedback from users, and acts on it, it can be most effective. I have used such an approach working with IDRC client organizations in Ethiopia and Tanzania (ESTC 1984; IDRC 1985).

Experts are useful if they catalyze reflection or provide fresh insights. It is always harder for an outsider to have information about an organization, how it works, what is working and what is not, than the insiders. But sometimes an outsider can shine a light of rationality and structured thinking through the fog of hidden agendas. In practice it is often difficult to draw a strict line between inside and external evaluation and a combination usually works best for many purposes (Patton 1982).
How to create a learning organization

A learning organization has been defined as one which creates, acquires and transfers knowledge, and modifies its behaviour to reflect new knowledge (Garvin 1993). It is responsive to its environment, reorganizing its own structure to adapt to or influence the environment purposefully (Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith 1992). A learning organization incorporates not only single and double loop learning so that it can reorganize in response to learning, but it also learns how to learn (Argyris and Schon 1978).

The experience with building learning organizations in the corporate private sector shows that they must use systematic problem solving techniques, experimentation (including risk taking), learning from past experience (examining failures) and learning from others ("benchmarking" based on what similar organizations have learned). It has been found that creating time and space in the organization for reflection is essential and that this has proven benefits in cost saving terms (Garvin 1993).

Training combined with career and organizational development (Human Resource Development) have been found to be effective when linked with evaluation to enhance organizational learning. This type of in-house training creates a learning culture that integrates with the way people work and initiates a continuous process in the organization rather than being an episodic event. In order for an organization to learn and thus to have an enhanced capacity for change there must be systematic sharing of learning by individuals in the organization. But this type of training cannot be parachuted in as a standard formula. The evaluation has to relate to the organization’s context and culture (Preskill 1994).

In a completely different context, we have found that creating reflective institutions is an important step in trying to move towards sustainability or to develop strategies for sustainability, working with non-governmental or even governmental agencies in the South (IUCN 1996 a). This work is still in its early stages but we have found that introducing a questioning approach to ecosystem and human wellbeing within an organization seems to bring it to the point where it needs to restructure itself or at least to begin to work differently. The following characteristics of reflective institutions have been defined:
- Creating spaces for reflection
- Constructive identification of failure
- A tendency to breed other reflective institutions
- An explicit vision of past, present and future
- Strong horizontal linkages
- Hypothesis led planning
- Feedback - experience informs and changes policy (IUCN 1996 b).
We have found that the adoption of a questioning approach also provides the basis of the methodology that explores the state of the human and ecosystems, what needs to be done about it (strategies for sustainability) and how to measure change. Questions are used as a probe to examine the system and assess it (IUCN 1996a; 1996c).

**Examples of training methods and tools**

I have included here a few comments on Human Resource Development training and some of the tools I have tested and adapted when doing participatory M&E over the last twenty years. These are the Intent Structure and the Issue Based Format for structured argument.

Although I have not used it myself, I include some notes on an HRD model for training for information purposes. Participants may have their own experiences to add to this. This model incorporates continuous evaluation into an organization's structure by means of a training program that is combined with career and organizational development (Preskill 1994). It is one of a number of approaches currently in use for organizational learning in the North by public, private and community sector organizations.

The model for training and evaluation aims to create a learning culture in the organization by integrating it with the way people already work and with the context in which the organization works. The process begins with an assessment of management's commitment to learning. Communicates this commitment to members of the organization, makes the first training intervention, models a process of learning around an issue of concern in the organization, publicizes and celebrates the results, and then expands these efforts.

Evaluation is integral to each of these steps, starting with a needs assessment, evaluating the training program design before implementing it, evaluating it in operation, finding out what learning has occurred, testing the learning afterwards and finally evaluating the impact on performance in the organization. This is done through a process of reflection that involves organization members in dialogue and action planning. This means that the learning is collective and institutionalized (Preskill 1994).

The intent structure is a tool we have adapted from systems engineering (Warfield 1976) and used in Mazingira Institute in a variety of ways over the last twenty years. It is best described as an ends-means diagram, and can be used in its simple form as an objectives tree. It portrays the values, goals, objectives and detailed actions of an organization, program or project as a hierarchy. Every item on the diagram has a purpose, which is to carry out the objective above it, and every item below it supports its purpose (see diagram 1). Thus every item is both an end and a means. An example is shown in diagram 2.
One of the ways of using the intent structure in this form of card game is to make one as a card game involving all the stakeholders or trainees in an organization. The various objectives, activities and even overall values of the organization are written on cards and arranged in a hierarchy which links them, showing which activities and objectives contribute to the achievement of higher level ones and in turn how their purposes are to be achieved by lower level objectives or activities. An example of an intent structure derived in this way is shown in diagram 3.

The intent structure provides a learning tool about the purpose of the organization, program or project and a framework for evaluating it. Each item on the diagram can be used as a question. For example: "Does providing a nutrition centre and employing a nutritionist improve residents levels of health?" (See diagram 3).

An adapted form of the intent structure can also be used to represent the evaluation research design, showing the projects or components being evaluated, and the sources of information which are to be used to find out whether the objectives are being achieved (see diagram 4). The statements of objectives can be turned into questions and then questionnaires to be applied to different data sources.

Each objective is used to formulate questions as to whether lower level activities actually support them or not: for example, "Did the Farming Systems Research Project contribute to building research and teaching capability?" (see diagram 5). This is a helpful layout for an in-house evaluation task force because it enables people with little survey experience to formulate questionnaires based on what they want to know about how the system is working. For example they can design a questionnaire that frames the question of whether the results of the Farming Systems Research Project were used in terms that can be responded to by farmers, or extension agents.

The answers to the questionnaires can be assessed to find out what the problems and issues are arising from the evaluation. And a similar format can be used to present the results of an evaluation, showing the issues that have emerged from the questionnaires in relation to the objectives which they are not meeting (see diagrams 6 and 7).

Another use we have found for the intent structure is to display the relationship between indicators and the conceptual framework within which they are developed. An indicator always measures the achievement of some purpose, even if it is a proxy indicator which has an assumed relationship to that purpose. Thus an intent structure can show the hierarchy of values, goals and objectives within which the indicators are derived, and either the project components and actions which are being measured or the dimensions of the system being measured. Diagrams 8 and 9 show how we derive indicators for the Barometer of Sustainability in the IUCN project on assessing sustainability.
The **Issue Based Format** is a different tool which we have used in many contexts because it is equally as adaptable as the intent structure and can often be used in combination with it. Issues that emerge from M&E need to be discussed by the various stakeholders in order for conflicting points of view to be aired and follow up actions to be agreed. The issue based format provides an agenda for a meeting at which those concerned can discuss the issues and actions. The format presents the issue backed by the data from the evaluation. This can be provided in the form of accompanying reports or annexes and should be cross referenced to the issue if there is a lot of evidence or if there is likely to be argument about it that needs back-up.

We have modified the format over the years to suit various applications, in a consultative process with the stakeholders concerned. The main characteristic is the statement of why it is an issue and the actions that need to be taken. These can be presented as alternatives, prioritized, or set as performance targets. It is useful to identify which of the stakeholders is affected by the issue. Other aspects can be included as shown in the examples given in diagrams 10-13.

The main purpose of the issue based format is to provide a tool for informed argument for people or organizations with different points of view. It enables them to make value judgements based on data, negotiating their different interests.

We have used the format for policy review or policy development workshops, project or program evaluation and for development research use by stakeholders. Our format for reviewing research on informal transport was used by policy makers and was also used as evidence in a commission of enquiry into the motor insurance industry.

Although these two tools, the intent structure and the issue based format, were developed by Mazingira Institute in these forms in the 1970s and are based on applications in the design and management sciences or systems engineering in the 1960s, they are appropriate for the stakeholder types of evaluation which have been characterized as typifying M&E in the 1990s.
Diagram 1: basic form of the intent structure

- **most general objectives or values**
  - why is this objective sought?
  - how is this objective to be accomplished?

- **overall objectives**
  - the one above is the end for which the one below is undertaken
  - the one below is the means by which the one above is to be achieved

- **specific objectives**
  - why?
  - how?

- **detailed objectives or actions aimed at implementing specific objectives**
  - end
  - means

- **component or sub-activities**
Diagram 4: Intent structure for designing a program evaluation

- Overarching values on which the program is based
- Overall goals and objectives of the program
- Specific objectives which translate into overall evaluation research questions
- Project components or projects which are to be assessed by asking questions specific to them
- Questionnaires for each source of information
FIGURE 3: TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD: OBJECTIVES, QUESTIONS, PROJECTS AND DATA SOURCES

Diagram 5
Diagram 6: issues emerging from a program evaluation

- overarching values on which the program is based
- overall goals and objectives of the program
- specific objectives of the program
- project components or projects
- issues that have emerged from each project in relation to the program objectives
FIGURE 4: ISSUES EMERGING FROM THE OVERALL OBJECTIVES

Diagram 7
Diagram 8: Intent structure for developing indicators

- overarching values
- goals and objectives
- dimensions of system needing measurement
- indicative issues
- indicators or performance measurements
Intent Structure for the Barometer of Sustainability

Diagram 9
HALF OF ALLOTTEES PAY OVER ONE THIRD OF INCOME FOR HOUSING (para.7.13-15)

Related Objectives

6.16 To provide tenure to land at a price residents can afford.

2.02 To provide for the physical, social and economic needs of the urban low income groups.

Who is Affected by the Issue?

Dandora residents; future site and service project planners.

Time Frame

Medium term

Why is it an Issue?

It is generally accepted as desirable that households should not need to pay more than one third of their income for housing and related services (including utilities, rates and land rent); among the sampled population, about one half pay a higher proportion. Although average figures for expenditures on food showed that most of the population suffered no undue hardships as a result of high housing expenses, some of those poorer households were reported as often going without food (MEDIS 6). In addition to these and similar consequences, it may be that high housing costs are obliging some allottees to leave Dandora.

Possible Alternatives

1. Provide accurate information about costs to applicants for future site and service plots that they may better be able to decide if they can afford the charges.

2. Introduce construction financing conditions for building groups as outlined in MEDIS 6.

3. Introduce the option of progressive (low-start) mortgages for the lowest eligible income groups in future projects.

4. Re-examine utility tariffs with a view to introducing a more progressive charging system.

5. Explore the possibilities of utilising rain water for certain household activities in order to reduce consumption of and thus payment for mains water.

Diagram 10
THE NEED TO IDENTIFY RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN CLOSE
CONSULTATION WITH USERS

Why is it an issue?

If research problems are not properly identified there is the
likelihood of working on a problem which is not relevant to the
user. The attitude maintained by many researchers that they
already know the felt needs or problems of the farmers has been
proven wrong time and time again by the inappropriateness of the
research results they obtain. In a developing country where high
calibre researchers are in short supply and capital is scarce,
working on problems which are not relevant to users cannot be
justified under any circumstances. The most effective mechanism
by which relevant problems can be identified is by involving the
users themselves. A survey of the farmers' problems must be made
first, preferably in a dialogue with them. Otherwise one cannot
be sure about the relevance of the problem under consideration;

Workshop Discussion

The issue was agreed as stated. However, it was pointed out that
the establishment of peasant organizations, collaborative work
between IAR and Ministry of Agriculture, and the increase in
government commitment in this respect, have all helped to improve
farmer/researcher/extension agent interaction. It was further
elaborated that Farming Systems Research multi-disciplinary surveys
and the recent Training and Visits program of the Ministry of
Agriculture will help in solving the problem of identifying research
problems in consultation with users.

Who is affected?

Users including farmers, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of State
Farms, Ministry of Coffee and Tea Development, because their felt
problems are not addressed and as a result increased production is
not achieved. Farmers are also affected in the sense that they will
have to learn to consult and to test as well as to farm.

Researchers because, if the solution they obtain after so much time
and effort is ineffective in solving farmers' problems, it can be
both frustrating and embarrassing.

Government because spending money on research which does not solve
farmers' problems may lead to the assumption that research money is
wasted and difficulty in justifying further allocations of scarce
resources.

Diagram 11
Performance Targets

Any improvement made in the research system should not only facilitate the identification of priority problems but ultimately the identification of viable solutions. Another target is the participation of farmers in managing their own affairs together with their increased confidence in the researchers. Increased production is a further target, and finally improved research support.

Proposed actions endorsed by the Workshop

T1/1 In order to reach these targets the research process should be redefined to incorporate:

1. Surveys of farmers' problems in the form of a dialogue with them.
2. Identification of the main limiting factors which require technological solutions.
3. Searching for those solutions first within the community, then the country, then the region and lastly outside the region.
4. Conducting adequate verification trials.
5. Disseminating tested viable solutions.
6. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the solutions.

Further actions recommended by the Workshop

T1/2 Existing extension services should be strengthened and new ones established for consultation purposes (for problem identification).

Action should be taken by Ministry of Agriculture in the short term and sustained continuously.

T1/3 IDRC and other donors should look carefully during the formulation of projects to verify that the active participation of users is solicited.

Action should be taken by IDRC and other donors in the short term and sustained.

Diagram 11 (cont.)
THERE IS A NEED FOR MORE AND BETTER ON-FARM RESEARCH INCORPORATING FARMERS' KNOWLEDGE

Why is it an issue?
The Intercropping Project did not produce usable results because there was no research on farmers' fields or under farmers' conditions. The PGIP ran the risk of producing results not useful to farmers by using artificial fertilizers. Even FSR has been testing crop-specific technologies proposed by individual scientists and using farmers mainly as sources of land and labour. Evaluation surveys showed that, with a few exceptions, most scientists, students, teachers and extension personnel do not consider farmers' knowledge important except in providing baseline information. Technologies are presumed to originate from research sources. Some, but not all, members of the Grain Storage team realized the importance of traditional technologies and traditional knowledge.

A major fault of the aborted Charcoal Stoves Project was the failure to properly survey the conditions under which the technological solution was supposed to perform, or to consult users. Similar attitudes affected the Sorghum Utilization Research. If SUA is to fulfill its mandate and produce usable research results, research must include the farmer as a more active participant. Research needs to be carried out under farmers' conditions. Traditional and local knowledge needs to be respected and utilized by researchers.

Who is affected?
Farmers who need improved technologies that will increase their production given existing conditions and resource constraints.

Researchers who need an improved field research method, and access to traditional knowledge if they are to produce useful outputs.

Government which needs an effective way of implementing its policy to improve the productivity and standard of living of the small farmer.

Performance Targets

Short Term: Awareness among more students and researchers of how to document and utilize traditional knowledge; adoption of farmers' conditions as target criteria for the design of technologies (including crop breeding); and, more active participation of farmers in research through researcher/farmer dialogue.

Long Term: Research results which are usable by farmers and others.

What has been done so far?
1. DFSR works more pragmatically with farmers and combines animal and crop investigations.
2. Some techniques developed in FSR Project have shown increased productivity of specific crops and could be adopted by farmers.
3. There is some awareness of the complexities of on-farm research through FSR and of the value of traditional knowledge through GSP.

Diagram 12
### 3.

**SERVICES AND LAND USES WOMEN NEED ARE NOT PLANNED FOR**

**What is the issue?**

The urban poor in many parts of Africa rely on subsistence agriculture and livestock rearing, which is mainly done by women. Yet this is seldom planned for or supported as a land use, and is more often illegal. Women predominate among informal sector traders, but this is also seldom planned for or permitted as a land use, and is often harassed. Zoning regulations which restrict trade in or near the home prevent women carrying out income generating work which can be combined with their reproductive tasks at home. Day care is not considered a basic service, leading to extra work burdens on older female children. The absence of basic services, especially water and fuel, increases women's work load and poverty. Poor female-headed households cannot pay for high standard, individual service connections, and prefer communal services and improved environmental health conditions. "Private sector" approaches to urban housing production fail to reach women because they fail to reach the poorest.

**What are the obstacles to change?**

1. Laws and procedures governing land use planning and zoning (see issue 2 above).
2. Absence of women in decision making and planning in African towns.
3. Lack of data and knowledge about women among male planners in Africa and international agencies.
4. Lack of sufficient settlement upgrading and credit programs designed for the poorest 20% of urban populations where women predominate.

**What successful experience can be built on?**

1. Community development experience, mainly of NGOs, in settlement upgrading.
2. Malawi's encouragement and protection of urban food growing.
3. The "Green Zones" of the city of Maputo, Mozambique.
4. UNICEF's Urban Basic Service Program.

**What are the priority actions?**

1. Changes in land-use planning and regulations to:
   a. include informal sector trade and commerce with appropriate controls within residential areas.
   b. include food and fuel production areas in or near low income residential areas, together with appropriate extension services; temporary land uses for allotments could be effective.
2. Inclusion of gender issues in urban planning and management.
3. See also issues 6 and 7.
References:
Ahmed, Viyar and Michael Bamberger n.d "Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): the South Asian Experience" copy supplied by IDRC Evaluation Unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>FACILITATOR/ RESOURCE PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30 - 10.30</td>
<td>Inaugural Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Guest: Dr. Chitra Naik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. of India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-1.00</td>
<td>Understanding M &amp; E as Internal Review Processes</td>
<td>Dr. T.V. Rao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-2.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-3.30</td>
<td>Organizations' Experiences: Participants' presentations on M &amp; E/ Review processes used by them</td>
<td>Prof. Ranjit Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Fred Carden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30-4.00</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00-5.30</td>
<td>Organizations' Experiences (cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SESSION</td>
<td>FACILITATOR/ RESOURCE PERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-10.30</td>
<td>Analysing Organizational experiences:</td>
<td>Dr. Ashoke Chatterjee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- strengths/ weaknesses of methods used;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- areas of concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- identification of areas for expanded use of M&amp;E in organizational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- other related issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Tea/Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.30</td>
<td>Scope of M &amp; E</td>
<td>Ms. Diana Lee Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- methods/ tools/ techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evaluator's knowledge/ skills/ attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-1.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30-3.00</td>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>Small Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- towards a shared understanding of M&amp;E processes</td>
<td>(4 groups moderated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- assessing needs for systematizing M&amp;E efforts</td>
<td>Resource Persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- identifying issues needs and approaches for building M&amp;E into projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- exploring needs for and possibilities of linking organizations for M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-5.00</td>
<td>Group wise Presentations</td>
<td>Prof. Ranjit Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>Dr. Fred Carden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00-5.30</td>
<td>Concluding Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SESSION</td>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 17, 1997</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30-10.30</td>
<td>Introducing the Workshop.</td>
<td>Mr. Girish Sohani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants' self introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tea / Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-1.00</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Plenary interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarification of Concepts :</td>
<td>Dr. T.V. Rao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* M&amp;E vis-a-vis Internal Review Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Use of M &amp; E to facilitate understanding of vision / mission / philosophy / goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Assessing efficiency and effectiveness / impact of organisation / projects / programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SESSION</td>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.00-3.30 | Session 3                    | Plenary individual presentations | * State-of-the-art of M&E currently practiced.  
<p>|           | Participants' Sharing        | Prof. Ranjit Gupta               | * Concerns of participating organisations. |
|           | M &amp; E / Review Processes used by them: | Dr. Fred Carden                |                                        |
|           | * For assessing compatibility of Project/programme goals with organisational mission. |                                 |                                        |
|           | * Outcomes of these processes. |                                 |                                        |
|           | * Concerns                   |                                 |                                        |
| 3.30-4.00 | Tea / Coffee                 |                                 |                                        |
| 4.00-5.30 | Session 3 (Contd....)        |                                 |                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>METHODOLOGY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2 :</td>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Plenary Interactive Input</td>
<td>* Understanding of the scope of application of M&amp;E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Ashoke Chatterjee</td>
<td>* Identification of requirements for systematizing M&amp;E activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18, 1997</td>
<td><strong>Scope of M&amp;E :</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-10.30</td>
<td>* Strengths / weaknesses of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methods used, areas of concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emerging out of participants'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Identification of areas for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expanded use of M&amp;E in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisational development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Related issues :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- resistance to evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- apprehension about utility of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- who should evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transparency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.30</td>
<td>Session 5 ...contd....</td>
<td>Plenary interactive input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scope of M&amp;E (Contd...)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- methods / tools / techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evaluator's knowledge / skills / attitude.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Diana Lee Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-1.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SESSION</td>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30-3.00</td>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>Consensus / Synthesis</td>
<td>* Understanding of the scope of the scope of application of M&amp;E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. Tea / Coffee)</td>
<td>* Identification of requirements for systematizing M&amp;E activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small group Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 groups moderated by Resource Persons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-5.00</td>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Collective understanding of the current role / future prospects for use of M&amp;E in organisational development and strategic management of development of development research organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Group Reports Sharing / discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00-5.30</td>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>Summarizing / Wrap up</td>
<td>Resource Persons Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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