



METHODOLOGY FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION TRAINING HANDOUTS

Toolkit

Delivering Good Governance

METHODOLOGY FOR
MONITORING AND EVALUATION
OF TRAINING PROGRAMMES FOR
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

TRAINING HANDOUTS

Toolkit

The Toolkit contributes to the enhancement of Human Resources Management by providing concrete tools and procedures to be implemented within the Monitoring and Evaluation of the training programmes delivered to public employees.

**CENTRE OF EXPERTISE
FOR LOCAL
GOVERNMENT
REFORM**

in cooperation with

ISIG
Institute of
International Sociology
of Gorizia

April 2018



**CENTRE OF EXPERTISE
FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM**

© 2018



COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

INDEX

INDEX	1
1 SESSION 1 – THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY TOOLKIT	2
1.1 READING	2
1.2 INDIVIDUAL EXERCISE	2
1.3 FACILITATED DEBATE	2
2 SESSION 2 – MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMMES IN LOCAL CONTEXT	3
2.1 PRESENTATION OF LOCAL CONTEXT	3
2.2 FACILITATED DEBATE	3
3 SESSION 3 - UNDERSTANDING THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	4
3.1 GROUP EXERCISE	4
3.1.1 <i>Group brainstorming</i>	4
4 SESSION 4 - SETTING UP THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
4.1 READING 1	5
4.2 READING 2	6
4.3 GROUP EXERCISE	6
4.4 GROUP EXERCISE	8
5 SESSION 5 – IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY	9
5.1 READING	9
5.2 GROUP EXERCISE – ROLE PLAY	9
6 SESSION 6 – IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY – MONITORING ACTIVITIES...	11
6.1 READING	11
6.2 GROUP EXERCISE	12
7 SESSION 7 - IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY – EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.....	13
7.1 READING	13
7.2 GROUP EXERCISE – ROLE PLAY	17

1 SESSION 1 – THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY TOOLKIT

1.1 READING

Please read the following paragraphs on Quality Standards and Quality Assurance processes:

- “Quality assurance (QA) is a way of preventing mistakes or defects in manufactured products and avoiding problems when delivering solutions or services to customers.”
(The Quality Assurance Journal. 2000. John Wiley & Sons)
- “Quality standards for programming strengthen and enable the achievement of results and development effectiveness and efficiency when reflected in programmes and projects. This policy outlines UNDP’s programming quality standards and mechanisms to assure programming quality. All country, regional, and global programmes and projects are required to adhere to the quality standards for programming, for which managers are accountable.”
(UNDP. 2016. *Quality Standards and Assurance Policies*)

1.2 INDIVIDUAL EXERCISE

- Starting from the definition above, please reflect individually on the concept of Quality Assurance.
- Please provide up to 3 examples, coming from your line of work/experience, in which Quality Assurance is or could be relevant. Please note down your answers in the provided post-its.

1.3 FACILITATED DEBATE

- Why do you consider Quality Assurance to be relevant for the indicated examples?
- Is Quality Assurance relevant for professional training programmes?
- Etc.

2 SESSION 2 – MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMMES IN LOCAL CONTEXT

2.1 PRESENTATION OF LOCAL CONTEXT

- Participants present the country/regional/local - specificities of professional training programmes for local government and the monitoring and evaluation, existing frameworks or potentialities.

2.2 FACILITATED DEBATE

- What are the local needs?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of monitoring and evaluation processes in the local context?
- What are the opportunities and threats for establishing/straightening monitoring and evaluation strategies of training programmes for local government?

3 SESSION 3 - UNDERSTANDING THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 GROUP EXERCISE

3.1.1 Group brainstorming

The following example of a professional training course is given:

- Topic - Human Resource Management;
- Target - Senior Civil Servants;
- Amount of training hours - 25.

Please brainstorm within your group about what Evaluation Questions would you need to operate, in order to assess the “Financial resources” aspects concerning the Training Course.

Please identify the questions for each of the evaluation phases and insert them in the following table

Please delegate a member of your group to present your results in a plenary session

FINANCIAL RESOURCES	KEY QUESTIONS FOR EVALUATION		
	<i>EX-ANTE</i>	<i>IN-ITINERE</i>	<i>EX-POST</i>
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.

4 SESSION 4 - SETTING UP THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY

PART 1

4.1 READING 1

Please read the following paragraphs concerning the information about a fictitious training programme (composed by 10 training courses):

“Beneficiaries of the courses were civil servants working in local administrations offices.

Each course lasted 10 working days (60 hours in total) and trained 25 participants.

The Training Course plan provided a total allocation budget of 220.000 euros to cover a total of 10 training courses over a period of six months.

The subdivision of the budget was as follows:

Budget Heading	Planned budget	Total
1.Administrative staff	50,000- €	
2.Lecturers/trainers	80,000- €	
3.Accommodation (board and lodging) of the participants	50,000-€	
4.Availability of premises and equipment	40,000-€	
		220.000 - €

Composition of the administrative staff:

- For each training course: two persons working full-time from one month before the beginning of the course to one month after the end of it; one person working part-time all over the course;
- For the overall administration: two persons for half of their working time

Composition and engagement of the training staff:

- For each training course: 1 lecturer for 15 hours; 1 principal trainer for 15 hours + 5 hours for the initial assessment of participants + 5 hours for the final assessment of participants; 2 assistant trainers for 30 hours + 5 hours for the initial assessment of participants + 5 hours for the final assessment of participants.

Initial assessment of the participants:

- Preliminary knowledge test – average score of the participants: 65 points out of 100

Final assessment of the participants:

- Final knowledge test – average score of the participants: 85 points out of 100
- Satisfaction test – average score of the participants: 7,9 points out of 10”

4.2 READING 2

Please read the following table:

CRITERIA	DEFINITION	EMPIRICAL REFERENCES FOR THE <i>EX-ANTE</i> EVALUATION	EMPIRICAL REFERENCES FOR THE <i>EX-POST</i> EVALUATION
Input	Resources dedicated to the implementation of the course	Amount of allocated resources	Amount of actually used resources
Output	Amount of produced activities and reached beneficiaries	Amount of scheduled activities Planned number of beneficiaries	Amount of performed activities Actual number of beneficiaries
Outcome	Benefits of the intervention in terms of beneficiaries and their context of activity	Expected benefits for the beneficiaries Expected changes in the situation in which the intervention has to be implemented	Effective benefits for the beneficiaries Effective changes in the situation in which the intervention has been implemented
Effectiveness	Link between the initiative and its outcome	Potential of the intervention to produce the outcome	Outcome actually produced by the intervention
External consistency	Consistency with relevant policies	Logical connection between the objective and the policies the objective is supposed to improve	Logical connection between the achieved objective and the policies the objective is supposed to improve
Efficiency	Ratio between costs and output/outcome of the intervention	Costs/output ratio Costs/outcome ratio	Real costs/real output ratio Real costs/real outcome ratio
Compliance	Meeting beneficiaries needs and expectations	Capability of the intervention to meet the beneficiaries' expectations	Achieved level of coverage of the beneficiaries' expectations
Reliability	Reliability of the implementing/delivering organisation of the initiative	Trustworthiness of the structures responsible for the implementation of the intervention	Proved trustworthiness of the structures that implemented the intervention
Impact	Total expected effects (positive/negative, intended/not intended), registered in the context of implementation	Total expected effects – positive, negative, intended, not intended - in the situation in which the intervention has to be implemented	Total effects – expected, not expected, positive, negative, intended, not intended - in the situation in which the intervention has been implemented

4.3 GROUP EXERCISE

Please brainstorm within your group, and, try to indicate, the relevant criterion (from the table in paragraph 4.2.) for each of the information given in paragraph 4.1.

Please identify a representative within your group that can illustrate your results in the plenary session.

You may use the following table to indicate your answers:

Information	Criteria

PART 2

4.4 GROUP EXERCISE

Please work within your group (each group will be assigned specific sets of indicators by the trainers).

For each of the following sets of Indicators, please try to define specific indicators that you would need in order to evaluate a professional training course:

SET OF INDICATORS

- Competence of administrative staff
- Competence of trainers
- Infrastructure and Equipment
- Sharing of resources
- Participants' expectation/satisfaction
- Participants' preparation/learning
- Participants' motivation
- Selection procedures
- Compliance with the strategic and regulatory framework
- Logistic organisation
- Didactic organisation
- Attendance registration system
- Time management system
- Internal organisation
- Willingness to apply acquired competences
- Applicability of acquired competences
- Work environment

Example:

FINANCIAL RESOURCES:

- 1.1 Costs for the implementation of the professional training
- 1.2 Costs for travel and accommodation of trainers and participants
- 1.3 Different sources of financing (e.g. own funds, contribution from public, private, international bodies, etc.)
- 1.4 Dedicated heading for potential extra expenses

Please identify, within your group, which tools would you need, for each indicator, in order to gather the needed data?

Example:

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

- 1.1 Costs for the implementation of the professional training

TOOL – Budget sheet of the training course.

5 SESSION 5 – IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY

5.1 READING

Please read Annex 1 and Annex 2 of the Methodology.

5.2 GROUP EXERCISE – ROLE PLAY

Please imagine that your working group is the body in charge with the supervision and the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation Methodology.

Each group focuses on 7 sets of indicators (i.e. to be indicated by trainers).

Please use within your group the Time Management Tool below, in order to:

- list in a time-ordered way all the data collection activities that have to be performed all over the monitoring and evaluation process (please refer to the tables in Annex 1 that gives the set of indicators and the evaluation phases when such indicators are needed);
- identify the specific tool to be used for each activity;
- identify the “person in charge” who will have the responsibility to collect/provide the data;
- identify the milestones, that is the completed document that indicates the correct completion of the activity;
- identify the deadlines, that is the time span within which each activity should be completed for the monitoring/evaluation purposes.

Please present your results in in the plenary session.

TIME MANAGEMENT TOOL

ACTIVITY	TOOL TO BE USED	PERSON IN CHARGE	MILESTONE	FORESEEN DEADLINE
1. Financial management		Administrative staff		
			1.1 Preliminary financial sheet	
			...	
			1.x Final financial sheet	
2. Expectation questionnaire			2.1 Elaboration of the tool	
			2.2. Data gathering (implementation of the tool)	
			2.3 Data analysis & report	
3. ...				

6 SESSION 6 – IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY – MONITORING ACTIVITIES

6.1 READING

The following Paragraphs give the basic information about the fictitious training programme – ACME, which is composed by 3 training courses (i.e. Course A, Course B, Course C).

Please read carefully the description of the programme:

THE TRAINING PROGRAMME - ACME

Beneficiaries of the programme are civil servants working in local administrations offices.

The details of the planning are as follows:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| • n. of courses to be financed | 10.- |
| • n. of civil servants to be trained | 250.- |
| • total period to be covered by the programme - months | 6.- |
| • n. of working days covered by the programme - days | 100.- |
| • n. of training hours provided by the programme - hours | 600.- |
| • Overall administration responsibilities at the central level - two persons for half of their working time for 8 months - days/person | 160.- |

Total allocated budget € 220,000. -

The planned budget for each course is as follows:

- | | | |
|---|---|---------|
| • Remuneration of the administrative staff | € | 5,000.- |
| • Remuneration of lecturers/trainers | € | 8,000.- |
| • Accommodation (board and lodging) of the participants (estimated 20 € per person per day) | € | 5,000.- |
| • Premises and equipment | € | 4,000.- |

The schedule for each course provides for a duration of 10 working days and a total of 60 hours.

Minimum requested attendance: 75% of the total training hours

Foreseen composition of the administrative staff for each course:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| • two persons working full-time from one month before the beginning of the course | |
| • to one month after the end of it – in total days/person | 100.- |
| • one person working full-time over the course - days/person | 10.- |
| • share part of the overall administration cost – days/person | 16.- |

Composition and engagement of the training staff:

- 1 lecturer – hours/person 15.-
- 1 principal trainer (15 hours for training + 5 hours for the initial assessment of participants + 5 hours for the final assessment of participants)- in total hours/person 25.-
- 2 assistant trainers (30 hours for training + 5 hours for the initial assessment of participants + 5 hours for the final assessment of participants) – in total hours/person 80.-

6.2 GROUP EXERCISE

Please work within your group so to delineate a Monitoring Strategy of the Programme.

Please debate and try to identify the following aspects:

- Goals of the monitoring activities (i.e. Why is the ACME Programme in need of monitoring activities?)
- Milestones for the Monitoring activities (i.e. When should monitoring activities be performed – please elaborate a timeline/Gantt chart indicating the milestones);
- Indicators (thus data) and corresponding tools needed so to perform monitoring activities (i.e. What data, when and by means of what tools should be collected, so to perform monitoring/*in-itinere* evaluation);

What items do you consider should a Monitoring Report contain?

Please develop a draft of a possible “Monitoring Report” for the ACME Programme.

7 SESSION 7 - IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY – EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

7.1 READING

The following Paragraphs give the basic information about the fictitious training programme – ACME, which is composed by 3 training courses (i.e. Course A, Course B, Course C).

Please read carefully the description of the 3 training courses:

THE TRAINING PROGRAMME - ACME

Beneficiaries of the programme are civil servants working in local administrations offices.

The details of the planning are as follows:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| • n. of courses to be financed | 10.- |
| • n. of civil servants to be trained | 250.- |
| • total period to be covered by the programme - months | 6.- |
| • n. of working days covered by the programme - days | 100.- |
| • n. of training hours provided by the programme - hours | 600.- |
| • Overall administration responsibilities at the central level - two persons for half of their working time for 8 months - days/person | 160.- |

Total allocated budget	€	220,000.-
-------------------------------	----------	------------------

The planned budget for each course is as follows:

- | | | |
|---|---|---------|
| • Remuneration of the administrative staff | € | 5,000.- |
| • Remuneration of lecturers/trainers | € | 8,000.- |
| • Accommodation (board and lodging) of the participants (estimated 20 € per person per day) | € | 5,000.- |
| • premises and equipment | € | 4,000.- |

The schedule for each course provides for a duration of 10 working days and a total of 60 hours.

Minimum requested attendance: 75% of the total training hours

Foreseen composition of the administrative staff for each course:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| • two persons working full-time from one month before the beginning of the course to one month after the end of it – in total days/person | 100.- |
| • one person working full-time over the course - days/person | 10.- |
| • share part of the overall administration cost – days/person | 16.- |

Composition and engagement of the training staff:

- | | |
|--|------|
| • 1 lecturer – hours/person | 15.- |
| • 1 principal trainer (15 hours for training + 5 hours for the initial assessment of participants + 5 hours for the final assessment of participants)- in total hours/person | 25.- |

- 2 assistant trainers (30 hours for training + 5 hours for the initial assessment of participants + 5 hours for the final assessment of participants) – in total hours/person

80.-

DETAILS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COURSE A

The course started on April 3 and closed on April 14.

The premises were the classrooms of the former primary school, rented from the local administration, in a small town with poor leisure opportunities.

The enrolled participants were 25.

They were accommodated in two inns managed by local owners.

The initial assessment was performed at the opening of the first day and tests were graded by the training team in the afternoon, after classes. At the preliminary knowledge test, the participants scored an average of 65 points out of 100.

The expected learning increase was set at 20 points.

Two participants disappeared after the first two days; the remaining 23 fulfilled the minimum attendance requirement.

During the course, one of the assistant trainers had health problems and for two days the second assistant trainer covered also his hours, being paid a small surcharge for the extra work.

The final assessment was performed the last day immediately before the course closure and tests were graded by the training team in the late afternoon.

At the final knowledge test the average score was 85 points out of 100; at the satisfaction questionnaire the average score was 6,5 points out of 10.

23 trainees received the final certification.

Summary table for the course A

	Planned	Effective
Duration	10 days	10 days
Enrolled participants	25	25
Participants following the course	25	23
Participants fulfilling the minimum attendance	25	23
Participants receiving the certificate	25	23
Initial knowledge test		65 points
Final knowledge test		80 points
Learning increase		15 points
Satisfaction questionnaire		6,5 points
Administrative staff costs	5,000.- €	5,000.- €
Teaching and training staff costs	8,000.- €	8,100.- €
Accommodation costs (18 € per day per 23 participants)	5,000.- €	4,140.- €
Premises and equipment	4,000.- €	2,500.- €
Delivery of documentation	Upon closure	Upon closure

DETAILS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COURSE B

The course started on April 17 and closed on April 28.

The premises were the meeting rooms of a Congress Center, reserved from the Hotel management, in the same hotel where the participants were accommodated; the hotel and the surroundings were rich in leisure opportunities.

The enrolled participants were 25.

The initial assessment was performed at the opening of the first day and tests were graded by the training team in the afternoon, after classes. At the preliminary knowledge test, the participants scored an average of 68 points out of 100.

The expected learning increase was set at 20 points.

21 participants fulfilled the minimum attendance requirement.

During the second week, one member of the administrative staff had family problems and for five days worked only part-time; as a consequence, the completion and delivery of the administrative documents was a little late.

The final assessment was performed the last day immediately before the course closure and tests were graded by the training team in the late afternoon.

At the final knowledge test the average score was 83 points out of 100; at the satisfaction questionnaire the average score was 8,9 points out of 10.

21 trainees received the final certification.

Summary table for the course B

	Planned	Effective
Duration	10 days	10 days
Enrolled participants	25	25
Participants following the course	25	25
Participants fulfilling the minimum attendance	25	21
Participants receiving the certificate	25	21
Initial knowledge test		68 points
Final knowledge test		83 points
Learning increase		15 points
Satisfaction questionnaire		8,9 points
Administrative staff costs	5,000.- €	5,000.- €
Teaching and training staff costs	8,000.- €	8,000.- €
Accommodation costs (22 € per day per 25 participants)	5,000.- €	5,500.- €
Premises and equipment	4,000.- €	5,500.- €

DETAILS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COURSE C

The course started on May 8 and closed on May 19.

The premises were the library reading rooms of a Community Center, made available at no cost by the local administration. The town offers some interesting leisure opportunities.

The enrolled participants were 25.

They were accommodated in a comfortable three stars hotel in the old town.

The initial assessment was performed at the opening of the first day and tests were graded by the training team in the afternoon, after classes. At the preliminary knowledge test, the participants scored an average of 60 points out of 100.

The expected learning increase was set at 20 points.

24 participants fulfilled the minimum attendance requirement; 1 participant left after three days due to family reasons.

The final assessment was performed the last day immediately before the course closure and tests were graded by the training team in the late afternoon.

At the final knowledge test the average score was 80 points out of 100; at the satisfaction questionnaire the average score was 8,0 points out of 10.

23 trainees received the final certification, 1 trainee did not achieve the minimum score at the final knowledge test.

Summary table for the course C

	Planned	Effective
Duration	10 days	10 days
Enrolled participants	25	25
Participants following the course	25	24
Participants fulfilling the minimum attendance	25	24
Participants receiving the certificate	25	23
Initial knowledge test		60 points
Final knowledge test		80 points
Learning increase		20 points
Satisfaction questionnaire		8,0 points
Administrative staff costs	5,000.- €	5,000.- €
Teaching and training staff costs	8,000.- €	8,000.- €
Accommodation costs (22 € per day per 25 participants)	5,000.- €	5,000.- €
Premises and equipment	4,000.- €	2,500.- €

7.2 GROUP EXERCISE – ROLE PLAY

Starting from the above mentioned fictitious case of the ACME training programme, please brainstorm within your group on how you would develop a Final Evaluation Report of the programme.

In order to prepare the report, please use the template provided below.

Please use post-it and cardboard at your disposal to note down your ideas.

Moreover, please use the following guiding questions within your group when working at the Monitoring Report:

- Can the budget effectively used (for each course and in total) considered to be satisfactory?
- What are the differences (for each course and in total) with reference to the planned budget? What are the reasons for those differences? Are the reasons acceptable?
- Did the total training time (for each course and in total) correspond to the planned training time? What are the reasons for the differences (if any)? Are the reasons acceptable?
- Did the total “administration” time (for each course and in total) correspond to the planned administration time? Did the completion of the administrative documentation comply with the deadlines? What are the reasons for the non-compliance (if any)? Are the reasons acceptable?
- Did the learning increase (for each course and in total) satisfy the expectations? What are the reasons for the differences (if any)? Are the reasons acceptable?
- Are the satisfaction levels (for each course and in total) acceptable? What are the possible reasons for the expressed levels?
- Are the courses results globally satisfactory for the Organizing Authority?
- If not, what are the reasons that caused the unsatisfactory results?
- What can be done to avoid, in the future courses, the encountered problems?
- What can be done to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the forthcoming courses?