

**USAID/REDSO/ESA REGIONAL WORKSHOP
on MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

held in Mombasa, Kenya January 5-10, 1997

*Fredi Munger, Team Leader
Bert Laurent, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist
Barbara Rossmiller, Principal Editor*

January 28, 1997

*DATEX, Inc.
799 Leesburg Pike
Suite 1150, North Tower
Falls Church, VA 22043*

*Contract #AEP-0085-I-00-2060-00
D.O. 21*



USAID/REDSO/ESA REGIONAL WORKSHOP on MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING

held in Mombasa, Kenya January 5-10, 1997

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

The reengineered USAID emphasizes managing for results documentation. This results orientation can be seen throughout USAID operating systems from planning through internal reviews to monitoring and evaluating the results of achievements.

Under this system, managers must have sufficient information to understand and demonstrate whether an assistance activity is achieving the intended result(s), and to make decisions related to the direction and resourcing of the activity.

Performance monitoring and evaluation are two of the formal management tools operating units use in obtaining performance information to manage for results. Of these two tools, performance monitoring is the least familiar to most USAID operating units.

DATEX, Inc. was retained to plan, conduct and facilitate a 5-day workshop on performance monitoring and its role in obtaining information germane to managing for results. Under the guidance of the REDSO/ESA, the company prepared a draft workshop agenda and training plan that was approved by the REDSO/ESA Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist who was the manager of this activity.

The activity manager and USAID/Washington Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Specialists provided DATEX with over two thousand pages of materials including source documents from the Country Experimental Labs and programs within the REDSO/ESA region. During the planning phase, meetings were held in Washington with the activity manager, who was in the States on other business. Based on these meetings, documents, and other technical materials, the team prepared a workshop schedule, session plans and materials that emphasized practical workplace skills in performance monitoring.

Originally, participants were to be staff from PVOs/NGOs funded by USAID and a limited number of project and program staff of USAID Missions for a total of 20 participants. Shortly before the program start date, DATEX learned that the workshop was to be offered to more USAID staff and fewer PVO/NGO staff. The actual participants numbered 30, with only 8 from PVO/NGO partners.

This change in group necessitated a corresponding change in the workshop program. The team reduced or eliminated elements focused on field collection of performance data, field-to-agency reporting, and use of performance information in activities management. Program elements which focused on managing business processes, using USAID standard planning and reporting formats, partnering with NGO/PVOs, and Reengineering were added. The REDSO/ESA staff offered to provide agency specific information and conducted two workshop sessions on the use and correct preparation of USAID planning and reporting formats.

The flexibility of the DATEX staff and generosity and professionalism of the REDSO/ESA staff permitted these last minute changes. This was truly a collaborative effort and an example of the excellence that can be achieved through partnering with contractors.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report serves two functions: (1) to document the workshop event according to the guidelines set forth in the Scope of Work, and (2) to provide the DATEX team's analysis of the status of Reengineering and performance monitoring for the purpose of defining value-added services that REDSO/ESA could provide.

CONCLUSIONS

- # The program was successful and nearly every participant gained something they perceived as useful from attending the workshop.
- # REDSO/ESA has important niche opportunities in the area of Performance MER.
- # Missions are at different stages in the reengineering process (planning, transition, alignment) and each stage requires a different type of service from REDSO/ESA.
- # The workshop served as a group Training Needs Assessment (TNA) that identified a series of immediate coaching needs.

The focus in this report summary is on *lessons learned* that can be applied to future workshops to push performance even higher, and that can identify new opportunities for REDSO/ESA to provide services to missions and programs throughout the region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The REDSO Performance Monitoring/Evaluation/Reporting (PMER) team could add value to mission activities through a combination of **training, coaching, advising** and **motivating** activities. The following are suggestions that arise out of the DATEX team's observation of workshop participants.

- # REDSO/ESA should conduct or contract for a systematic and comprehensive survey of mission staff. The survey would provide a rational basis for determining the kinds of motivational and skill building activities the Agency needs to undertake in order to implement successfully USAID's management-for-results frameworks.
- # REDSO/ESA should provide missions with Change Management assistance that would facilitate Reengineering transition and alignment processes and reduce mission staff anxiety caused by their new PMER roles and responsibilities.

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

- # REDSO/ESA could provide missions with assistance in establishing and maintaining performance improvement systems that will serve to continuously improve implementation of PMER business processes.

- # REDSO/ESA should create and maintain an internet discussion group on Performance Monitoring through which workshop participants and others can continue to consult with each other, engage in "real-time" exchange of experiences and models, and interact with subject area specialists in Africa and Washington.

- # REDSO/ESA should provide mission PMER staff and their partners with a series of tightly focused, on-site coaching sessions on topics suggested by participants at this workshop. Additional topics would emerge from the employee survey mentioned above. DATEX Inc. would be pleased to suggest additional topics upon request from REDSO/ESA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose of the Workshop
2. Impact on Participants
 - 2.1 Introduction
 - 2.2 Outcome and Impact Assessment Methodologies
 - 2.3 Proxy Measures for Anticipated Impact
 - 2.4 Summary of Participant Comments
3. Workshop Methods
4. Finding and Recommendations
 - 4.1 Range of Interests and Follow-on Activities
 - 4.2 Lack of Clarity on Performance Monitoring Systems
 - 4.3 Motivation
5. Participant Suggestions for Future Workshops

ANNEXES

1. Scope of Work
2. Workshop Agenda
3. List of Participants
4. Summary of Evaluations
5. Workshop Materials

1. PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

DATEX, Inc. was retained to plan, conduct and facilitate a 5-day workshop in Mombasa, Kenya, on performance monitoring and its role in obtaining information germane to managing for results.

Originally, participants were to be staff from PVOs/NGOs funded by USAID and a limited number of project and program staff of USAID Missions for a total of 20 participants. However, the actual participants numbered 30, with only 8 from PVO/NGO partners.

This change in the group necessitated a corresponding change in the workshop program. The DATEX team reduced or eliminated elements focused on field collection of performance data, field-to-agency reporting, and use of performance information in activities management. Program elements focused on managing business processes, using USAID standard planning and reporting formats, partnering with NGO/PVOs, and Reengineering were then added. The REDSO/ESA staff further provided agency specific information and conducted two workshop sessions on use and correct preparation of USAID planning and reporting formats.

The flexibility of the DATEX staff and generosity and professionalism of the REDSO/ESA staff permitted these last minute changes and adjustments. This was truly a collaborative effort and an example of the excellence that can be achieved through partnering with contractors.

This workshop focused on performance monitoring in managing the results of activities undertaken by USAID in collaboration with development partners. The workshop emphasized review, accountability and improvement at the results package (RP) and activity levels.

The purpose of the 5 day workshop was to provide staff from NGOs/PVOs funded by USAID and Mission personnel with:

- # Practical, workplace oriented performance monitoring skills and knowledge
- # Opportunities for practice of and feedback on this knowledge and skills
- # Strategies generated by participants for the continued application of this knowledge
- # Opportunities to create "products" that incorporate improved performance monitoring practices into their work as activities managers for USAID or NGOs/PVOs.

OBJECTIVES

To enable participants to develop a common vocabulary for discussing the basic elements of performance monitoring systems.

To give participants the ability to:

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

- # Describe how performance monitoring fits into USAID's reengineered operating system with special emphasis on: the partnership between missions and NGOs/PVOs; roles and responsibilities; differences between performance monitoring, research and evaluation; and alternative strategies for managing performance monitoring.
- # Develop/improve Performance Monitoring Plans and planning processes (including developing viable indicators) to meet the needs of USAID, Results Package Teams and NGO/PVO partners.
- # Analyze alternatives for supervising, managing or implementing performance monitoring in ways that: 1) maximize benefits to the Results Package Teams and NGO/PVO partners and 2) make efficient use of resources.
- # Improve communication of the results of performance monitoring to customers, partners, stakeholders, and colleagues through meetings (community, team, or board), annual reports, and other channels.
- # Suggest alternatives for optimizing how performance monitoring can be used in continuous improvement of the results of achievement rates from activities undertaken through partnerships between USAID and NGOs/PVOs.

2. IMPACT ON PARTICIPANTS

2.1 Introduction

Training is typically assessed at five levels, impact being the fourth level.

5 LEVELS OF TRAINING ASSESSMENT

Key Questions

1. Did the participants like the workshop? (affective outcome)
2. Did they learn what they were supposed to learn? (content outcome)
3. Were they able to apply what they learned on the job? (outcome)
4. Did the application have an impact on performance? (result/impact)
5. Was the change in performance worth the cost of the workshop? (value-added of program)

2.2 Outcome and Impact Assessment Methodologies

The workshop team used two individual written questionnaires, one open ended and one forced-response, to probe the first two outcome levels. In fact, the forced-choice questionnaire was

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

developed by a team of participants as one of their small-group activities.

These two instruments provided participant self-reports on several issues. In addition, staff observed participant performance and participation in group and project activity in order to judge level 1 and 2 outcomes.

The workshop team used the small group activity session from the Capturing Data topic to allow participants to develop an instrument for probing levels 3 and 4 (impact/results).

2.3 Proxy Measures for Anticipated Impact

One proxy for pre-judging impact is the projects the participants developed during the workshop. Using this standard, the workshop was successful at having a strong impact on:

- # 9 participants' ability to take leadership in **developing the Results Report/Resource Request document (R4's)**
- # 6 participants' ability to **train others** in their missions and partner organizations about performance monitoring
- # 6 participants= ability to take leadership in **developing or improving Performance and Monitoring Plans (PMPs)**
- # 6 participants ability to take leadership in **developing** meaningful and useful **indicators** for tracking performance.

Impact can not be definitively assessed until the participants return to their places of business and have an opportunity to apply what they have learned.

2.4 Summary of Participant Comments

SUMMARY

The most striking aspect of the participant's comments was the lack of a dominant voice. Their responses and comments do not cluster around one or two issues but ranged over 15 areas. Within these areas participants commonly took opposite positions wherein one statement would commend an activity as highly useful and another would complain about its irrelevance.

For example:

"I needed more exercises on the R4s. It is a very crucial skill. PMP was very well covered."

"Too much time wasted on R4 and PMP."

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

The range and variety of comments is indicative of several matters.

1. Human Resource Development (HRD) Needs in Non-Training Areas

HRD activities are commonly organized into four HRD areas:
Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating and Training.

Workshop participants' comments and behaviors indicate HRD needs in several **non-training areas**. For example, many participants exhibited needs in the motivational dimension. This is not surprising given the rapid pace of change in their organizations.

The workshop facilitators also observed that:

- # Most participants are still disoriented by USAID's new business processes and would benefit from sustained informal coaching from Mission leadership and REDSO/ESA.
- # Many missions need to provide staff with assistance in managing the change from a bureaucratized to an entrepreneurial organizational model. REDSO/ESA might be able to provide systematic assistance in Change Management.
- # Few of the participants came with an understanding of the rationale and context of the new M&E business processes, or of their roles and responsibilities in maintaining and improving them. An employee survey would enable the REDSO/ESA and Missions to identify problem issues and areas for staff development.
- # Several participants are still looking for detailed manuals or successful models to follow that will enable them to successfully complete their administrative tasks. The idea that they are in the vanguard of inventing new systems and new knowledge(s) is alarming to them. "We resent being guinea pigs," remarked one of the participants.

This is cause for concern because Reengineering success is more about inventing and improving processes than it is about following directions.

It may be necessary for the Agency to develop human resource strategies more aligned with Reengineering than the current methods for personnel recruiting, evaluation, and career path development. For example, individuals who exhibit a high potential for excellence in the new organizational model could be recruited into an accelerated career development path.

2. Group Diversity

A balanced diversity of perspective makes for a richer and more interesting workshop. Too much

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

diversity or imbalance makes it difficult for a program to be completely on-target for individuals or sub-sets of participants.

Imbalance in terms of expectations, needs and interests stems from two correctable aspects of the program development process: 1) distinguishing push from pull training models and 2) lengthy cycle time.

Push models are content driven. Successful push models set criteria for accepting or denying participation in the program. Pull models are participant-need driven. Successful pull models use extensive needs assessments to rapidly create customized programs to fit participants' immediate interests and needs.

This workshop was essentially a push model based on a curriculum needs analysis which was over 5 months old by the time the workshop was implemented.

During the implementation phase, DATEX and REDSO/ESA responded to the strongly articulated requests of sub-groups by customizing elements of the program to answer immediate and urgent needs. Some participants, more accustomed to pull model training, appreciated this flexibility, while others who are accustomed to strictly push models criticized the responsiveness as "not adhering to the program."

Push models are more useful if the participants are selected with reference to the established program content. This workshop's heavy emphasis on Reengineering, USAID reporting requirements and formats, and PMER system management was inappropriate for the few NGO participants.

Pull models are more useful if they are based on a systematic Participant Needs Assessment (PNA) conducted just prior to workshop design, development and delivery. PNAs allow program planners to cluster participants with complimentary needs in the same workshop.

3. Side Issues

Other side issues reflected in the comments include the disruptive effect caused by several participants' dissatisfaction over how per diem disbursements were calculated. This had a bearing on some participants' overall happiness, and ultimately perhaps their ability to engage fully in the technical aspects of the workshop.

Suggestions

- # Identify non-training Human Resource needs and interventions

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

- # Provide on-site Change Management support
- # Establish on-site process improvement programs for PMER
- # Reduce cycle time for workshop needs assessment, planning, development and implementation
- # Use both push and pull model training approaches, but in separate programs
- # Details regarding per-diem and limitations on number of travel days needs to be communicated to participants clearly and well in advance so this information can be factored into participant decision-making.

Please see Annex 4 for a summary of the workshop evaluations.

3. WORKSHOP METHODS

Preparation included analyzing source documents, preparing the workshop agenda, and developing the training plan and resource materials. The facilitators used a combination of the following methods in conducting sessions:

- # Lectures and presentations with moderate interactivity
- # Small Group Activities (guided and unguided)
- # Individual Activities
- # Written self instructional materials
- # Group question and answer sessions
- # Individual consultations with participants

4. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. *Range of Interests and Implications for Follow-on Activities*

FINDINGS

The participants' interests, levels of expertise and range of expectations for the workshop were extremely broad. This inhibited their achieving consensus regarding gains, unmet expectations and future workshop needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- # Any follow-up treatment of the topics requested by the participants would yield best results if carried out on site through a series of small, highly focused workshops or consultations.
- # Some follow -up workshops should use content-driven "push models." For these workshops

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

REDSO should establish a clear set of criteria for participant selection. Other workshops should use customized "pull models" wherein REDSO would perform a systematic TNA of staff nominated for Judging Results training by Missions. The workshop designs for these pull models would flow from specific needs and contexts.

- # Cycle time for training from Training Needs Assessments (TNA) and Participatory Needs Assessments (PNA) to actual workshop delivery should be short. Given the tempo of the change process for missions in transition to new systems, participants' needs will evolve at a significant pace.

4.2. Anxiety about Performance Monitoring Systems and Reengineering Change Management

FINDINGS

Participants are generally unclear about the progress and status of Performance Monitoring Systems in their Missions. Many are anxious about their roles as vanguards and do not see themselves as creators of new knowledge and new models.

Many participants expected the workshop facilitators and REDSO resource persons to provide them with official and approved PMER processes for them to learn and apply to their situations. Many participants were confused and frustrated to learn that prototype systems and processes do not yet exist and that they, in fact, are in the vanguard of inventing and validating PMER systems and approaches. As a consequence, for a number of participants the workshop became a "lightening rod" for discomfort with their roles and discontent over the unavailability of formal, tested, approved formats and documented success stories for tasks for which they are about to be held accountable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- # REDSO could provide missions with Change Management assistance that would facilitate the transition and alignment processes and reduce staff anxiety caused by their new roles and responsibilities.
- # Reengineered business processes will change for comfort unless they are managed for performance improvement. REDSO could provide missions with assistance in establishing and maintaining performance improvement systems that will serve to continuously improve performance monitoring and evaluation.
- # A profile that can help identify those officers displaying the attributes for high potential to succeed in an entrepreneurial and innovative environment should be developed and used for

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

staffing and personnel decisions and teaming selections. This can also inform decisions as to where future training investment might be most cost effective. REDSO has a niche opportunity to develop such a profile.

- # An internet discussion group on Performance Monitoring should be created, through which the participants can continue to consult with each other, engage in "real-time" exchange of experiences and models, and bolster any nascent willingness to take risks.

4.3. Individual Performance as a function of Motivation and Skill Levels

FINDINGS

Individual performance vis a vis any specific task is determined by both a person's willingness and ability to perform the task. Individuals who are both willing and able to perform often benefit from a "hands off" leadership style. People who are able but unwilling to perform require a leader's attention to motivational issues. Staff who are willing but unable to perform benefit from training or coaching. Staff who are neither willing nor able often require a more authoritarian leadership style, or a different task.

Participants varied along both the motivation and skills dimensions and exhibited each type of performance style. Most of the participants demonstrated high motivation levels with varying levels of ability: these individuals would benefit greatly from additional training and coaching. The facilitators also noted a number of participants who displayed high ability but low motivation levels. These individuals require motivational rather than training activities.

RECOMMENDATION

The change process requires greater and continuous technical support. REDSO, as the Agency's "Center of Excellence" has an opportunity to play an "illuminated path" role, providing targeted Change Management support for staff needing motivation.

Of the four basic elements of human resource development (recruitment, retention, training, and motivation) REDSO has a unique opportunity to play key roles in helping the Agency to retain and provide training support for high-motivation staff of varying levels of ability.

5. PARTICIPANT SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORKSHOPS

When asked what they would like to get from future workshops, the participants described a wide variety of interests that point to an important opportunity niche for REDSO to play a key role in

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

ongoing motivation and training for Mission staff. REDSO is also in a position to collect well prepared formats and success stories from Missions in the region and distribute them for guidance. A list of the points made by the participants follows:

Performance Monitoring

- # Specific data collection and analysis methodologies.
- # Further guidance on data collection, instruments, refresher courses or updates on PM&E.
- # More "tools" regarding approaches to customer service and incorporating customer assessments into monitoring plans over time.
- # The skills to implement PMP and to communicate results to partners.

R4s and Reporting

- # Need more training on R4s.
- # More on how systems are created for reporting.

Exchanging Information on Real Experiences / Networking

- # Sharing experiences on how PM helps to improve impact (lessons learned).
- # Consolidating knowledge and experience gained in this PMS workshop. I hope a practical case study will come out as a workshop material - practical application is always the most difficult part.
- # More working-group exercises on real-life examples.
- # More practical examples using USAID experience.
- # Experiences of PM in successful SOs/Missions.

New Operating System

- # How to use the NMS in performance monitoring.
- # More opportunity to know Reengineering concepts; management of outcomes.

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

- # More on partnerships and promoting a results-focused orientation with NGOs.
- # More in-depth on the Reengineering process and its implications for development.
- # Timing of workshops should not coincide with R4 submission time.

ANNEX 2: WORKSHOP AGENDA

Daily Agenda

MONDAY

Session 1 - (8:30 - 10:00)

Welcome
Personal Introductions
Program Orientation

Session 2 - (10:30 - 12:30)

Workshop Themes (Partnering, Performance, Monitoring)

Session 3 - (2:00 - 4:00)

Performance Monitoring in the Context of Reengineering
Performance Monitoring Networks
Workshop Products

Special Topics - (4:30 - 5:30)

Small Group Work Sessions

TUESDAY

Session 1 - (8:30 - 10:00)

Key Terms and Concepts
Preparing the R4

Session 2 - (10:30 - 12:30)

Preparing the R4
Identifying a Workshop Project

Session 3 - (2:00 - 4:00)

Individual/small group work and consultation around Workshop Projects

Special Topics - (4:30 - 5:30)

UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

WEDNESDAY

Session 1 - (8:30 - 10:00)

Planning and PMP Preparation

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

Session 2 - (10:30 - 12:30)

Planning and PMP Preparation

Session 3 - (2:00 - 4:00)

Individual/small group work and consultation around Workshop Products

Special Topics - (4:30 - 5:30)

Small Group Work Sessions

THURSDAY

Session 1 - (8:30 - 10:00)

Implementing

Measurements

Data Capturing Instruments

Session 2 - (10:30 - 12:30)

Individual and small group work around Workshop Projects

Session 3 - (2:00 - 4:00)

Independent Time

Special Topics - (4:30 - 5:30)

FRIDAY

Session 1 - (8:30 - 10:00)

Management

Workshop Project Reports

Session 2 - (10:30 - 12:30)

Workshop Project Reports

Session 3 - (2:00 - 4:00)

Workshop Evaluation

Closing

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

ANNEX 4: SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

Training assessments are generally conducted at five levels.

5 Levels of Training Assessment

Key Questions

1. Did the participants like the workshop? (affective outcome)
2. Did they learn what they were supposed to learn? (content outcome)
3. Were they able to apply what they learned on the job? (outcome)
4. Did the application have an impact on performance? (result/impact)
5. Was the change in performance worth the cost of the workshop? (value-added of program)

METHODOLOGIES

The workshop team conducted two individual written questionnaires, --one open ended and one forced-response-- to probe the first two levels indicated above. In fact, following guidance developed by the workshop team on item and response construction, the forced-choice questionnaire was developed by a team of participants led by a member who is also a statistician as one of their small-group activities.

These two instruments provided participant self-report on several issues. In addition, staff noted participant performance and participation in group and project activity in order to judge level 1 and 2 outcomes.

The workshop team used one small group session to have the participants develop a third level of instruments for probing levels 3 and 4. These instruments could be used to explore workshop impact if so desired.

OUTCOMES FROM FORCED-CHOICE QUESTIONNAIRE

N = 25 (1 questionnaire could not be coded due to multiple responses to several items// 3 questionnaires were not returned)

Choices = Disagree, Average, Agree

1. *This Performance Workshop has met its goals on program monitoring.*

Disagree = 0% Average = 40% Agree = 60%

2. *I am satisfied with the way the program monitoring workshop was conducted.*

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

Disagree = 8% Average = 40% Agree = 52%

3. *Hotel/Accommodations were perfect for me.*

Disagree = 20% Average = 60% Agree = 20%

4. *I am now familiar with all the aspects and steps of PM after the PMW.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 48% Agree = 48%

5. *The PMW has enabled me to complete the R4 Exercise.*

Disagree = 16% Average = 44% Agree = 28% NA = 12%

6. *The PMW was well conducted.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 52% Agree = 44%

7. *I am satisfied with the explanations I received on the R4.*

Disagree = 0% Average = 32% Agree = 64% NA = 4%

8. *The PMW has helped me to understand that USAID expects NGOs to demonstrate impact of their activities.*

Disagree = 0% Average = 12% Agree = 84% NA = 4%

9. *The implementation format of the workshop facilitated my understanding of material and topics.*

Disagree = 8% Average = 44% Agree = 48%

10. *The PMW adequately covered all the relevant topics related to PM and R4.*

Disagree = 12% Average = 56% Agree = 28% NA = 4%

11. *The venue for the workshop was satisfactory.*

Disagree = 16% Average = 48% Agree = 28% NA = 8%

12. *The group tasks were well structured to help me participate fully.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 36% Agree = 60%

13. *The hypothetical tasks will enable participants to apply the skills learnt to a PMP for any SO.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 36% Agree = 60%

14. *The PMP give me an opportunity to exchange views/ideas/experiences with participants to improve PM in my work.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 4% Agree = 84% NA = 8%

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

15. *I am satisfied with the pre-workshop communications.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 40% Agree = 56%

16. *I have developed actual skills in developing performance monitoring plans.*

Disagree = 4% Average = 36% Agree = 60%

17. *I am satisfied with the logistics services I received during the workshop (ticket reconfirmation, complaints about hotel services, etc.).*

Disagree = 4% Average = 24% Agree = 72%

OUTCOMES FROM OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

1. *Please make any comments on the venue, accommodations, transportation or per diem aspects of the workshop.*

Venue comments were split 13 positive 11 negative 1 no response. Positive comments enjoyed the hotel and setting. Negative comments were about inadequate air-conditioning, lack of TV in rooms, power failures and climate

Per Diem comments were generally absent or positive with four complaints about per diem

Transportation: generally no comments, with one complaint about the taxi being too old.

2. *What did you gain from participating in this program?*

Administrative tasks were commonly cited, such as: ability to complete the R4 or PMP (18 responses together).

Clarification of basic concepts in re-engineering and performance monitoring were also frequently mentioned gains (9 each).

Networking was mentioned by 11 people as a workshop gain.

Managing and Partnering were cited 8 times.

Implementing data collection and/or instrument development was mentioned 3 times.

Project outcomes was mentioned once as a gain

3. *What would you like to get from future workshops?*

The responses regarding future workshops did not cluster. There were more than 18 response

Partnering for Performance Monitoring Workshop Final Report

categories which can be grouped into 13 clusters. This indicates a need for a Participant Needs Assessment and a Training Needs Assessment prior to finalizing invitations to a subsequent workshop.

- A. 5 people said they wanted performance monitoring lessons learned, case studies or successful examples of R4s to examine.
- B. 5 people wanted more on data collection or data analysis.
- C. 4 People wanted more management training.
- D. 3 people wanted more exposure to Reengineering concepts, policies, practices and impact on development.
- E. 3 People want a workshop on CSP, partnering with NGOs, or theoretical aspects of performance monitoring.
- F. 1 Person wanted workshops on indicators, planning, NMS, evaluation, sightseeing/fun, reporting systems, or a repeat of performance monitoring.

OUTCOME FROM OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON UNMET EXPECTATIONS

Responses vis-à-vis unmet expectations were also scattered and with similar weighting. This scatter implies a lack of homogeneity among the group in terms of their expectations, implying that closer attention must be paid at the TNA and PNA stages.

- A. 3 responses each regarding data collection/analysis and management.
- B. 2 responses each on indicators, implementation, CSP, NMS, and evaluation.
- C. 1 response on using/reporting, planning, R4, reporting formats for data from grantees, performance monitoring in general.
- D. 1 respondent had all expectations met.