## I. Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Code: | CLPCM |
| Project Title: | Basic Course on Project Monitoring and Evaluation for Local Government Units (LGUs) – Public Offering |
| Project Start: | October 1, 2017 |
| Project End: | December 30, 2017 |
| Project Price: | PHP 684,000.00 |
| Client Organization: | Various Local Government Units |

## II. Project Team

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Manager: | BERNADETTE D. RODRIGUEZ |
| Team Members: | ASHLEY MAY ALISON M. MONSANTO |
| | CLESA V. CORONA |
| | MICHELLE N. BELGA |
| | QUENNIE ANNE L. SANTOS |
| | MARIE JAY KAMILLE S. DAYHON |
| Supervising Fellow: | IMELDA C. CALUEN |
| Consultants/ Resource Persons: | JESSE T. DAVID |
| | REY O. MACALINDONG |
| | CLEMENT L. RASUL |
| | ADELINA H. VELASCO |

## III. Project Details

Project Description:

The Basic Course on Project Monitoring and Evaluation for Local Government Units (LGUs) is a three-day live-out training designed to provide the participants with the knowledge and skills needed to effectively monitor and evaluate project performance.

Project Objectives:

At the end of the training, the participants would have:

1. demonstrated increased awareness of the value of monitoring and evaluation in the implementation of development programs and projects;
2. identified the techniques, tools and approaches in monitoring and evaluation; and
3. prepared a monitoring and evaluation framework and plan.

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Type: | Training |
| Project Beneficiary: | Local Government Units |
| Regional Coverage: | Nationwide |

## IV. Project Accomplishments

Key Activities Implemented:

- Finalization of the Training Design
- Development of course promotional materials
- Marketing of the course to LGUs
- Invitation and Confirmation of participants
- Identification of Resource Persons/Technical Experts
- Development of Presentation Materials
- Conduct of Meetings with the training team and Resource Persons
- Preparation of Supplies, Materials, and other Logistical Requirements
- Conduct of the training
- Development of Project Accomplishment Report

Major Outputs:

1. *Training Design*

   The training design was comprised of seven (7) sessions and three (3) workshops. After the faculty meeting with the training team members from the Local Governance and Development Office (LGDO) and the resource persons, Mr. Rey O. Macalindong and Mr. Clement L. Rasul, and upon the approval of MD Imelda C. Caluen, the following changes were made on the draft training design:

- Session 3 or Designing an M&E Framework was changed to Introduction of Detailed M&E Matrix.
- A workshop was conducted after each session's lecture including Session 4 (Progress M&E), facilitated by Mr. Rasul and Session 5 (Results M&E) by Mr. Macalindong.
- Session 6 (Communicating and Reporting Monitoring and Evaluation Results) which was originally scheduled from 4:00-5:30PM on Day 2, was moved to Day 3 from 3:00-4:00PM after all the other sessions were covered.
- Session 7 (Designing a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan) was changed to M&E Work Program, followed by a workshop on the Detailed M&E Matrix.
- The presentation of the participants' final outputs was conducted on Day 3 from 3:30-5:30PM instead of 1:00-4:30PM.

The course was designed in such a way that every session would complement each other and that they eventually served as inputs for the three workshops.

The sessions and workshops were designed to fit the three-day training, as detailed below:

| | |
|---|---|
| DAY 1 (Tuesday) | • Session 1: Why is Monitoring and Evaluation Important in the Government Sector?<br>• Session 2: Understanding Monitoring and Evaluation<br>• Session 3: Designing a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework<br>• Workshop 1: Development of a Logical Framework |
| DAY 2 (Wednesday) | • Session 4: Results Monitoring and Evaluation<br>• Workshop 2: Development of a Results Monitoring and Evaluation Plan<br>• Session 5: Progress Monitoring and Evaluation |
| DAY 3 (Thursday) | • Progress Monitoring and Evaluation (continuation)<br>• Session 6: Monitoring and Evaluation Work Program<br>• Workshop 3: Development of a Progress Monitoring and Evaluation Plan<br>• Session 7: Communicating and Reporting Monitoring and Evaluation Results<br>• Presentation and Critiquing of Monitoring and Evaluation Plans |

2. *Conduct of Training*

The Basic Course on Project Monitoring and Evaluation for Local Government Units (LGUs) was conducted on November 21-23, 2017 at the OD Corpuz Hall 1, DAP in Pasig City. Some seventy-six (76) representatives from thirty (30) LGUs composed of the provinces of Guimaras, Bohol, Bulacan, Nueva Vizcaya, Pangasinan, Isabela, Laguna, Camarines Norte, Lanao del Sur, Agusan del Sur, Dinagat Islands, and Batanes; the cities of Muntinlupa; Manila; Marikina; Masbate; Tabaco, Albay; Ligao, Albay; San Jose del Monte, Bulacan; San Pablo, Laguna; Cabuyao, Laguna; San Pedro, Laguna; Oroquieta, Misamis Occidental; Lamitan, Basilan; Island Garden City of Samal, Davao del Norte; Cebu; and municipalities of Sipocot, Camarines Sur; Pinamalayan, Oriental Mindoro; Basud, Camarines Norte; and Real, Quezon.

Below are the highlights of each session and workshop:

*Session 1: Why is Monitoring and Evaluation Important in the Government Sector?*

In Mr. Jesse T. David of the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)'s discussion on Monitoring and Evaluation's Importance in the Government Sector, he differentiated monitoring from evaluation in the first part of his session. Monitoring, he shared, as defined by OECD-DAC, is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. On the other hand, evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy its design, implementation and results, principally used for learning and accountability.

He emphasized the role of M&E in the development process. According to him, it is important to evaluate development projects and programs because billions of pesos are spent on them by the government. Additionally, he said, given our limited resources, we need to identify which programs work and which do not. When evaluating, he shared that it is important to determine which are the most cost effective and have the greatest impact of the programs and projects that work as it can influence decision-making. In this way, our limited resources can be used more efficiently and can be reallocated toward more cost effective programs to achieve development goals. He also furthered that evaluation is important in the government to change policy priorities, new programs and implementation models, for halt programs that do not work, and to allocate resources to government programs that deliver higher results and impact.

Mr. David warned the participants of some of the risks when we do not evaluate programs and projects such as waste of public money due to ineffective policy, program or project, and missed opportunities to: 1) improve a policy, program or project 2) generate better benefits 3) save money which the government could have spent more on more worthwhile projects and 4) confidently attribute positive changes in a desired outcome to a policy, program or project and generate more support.

He also discussed the two key concepts on development effectiveness – Managing for Development Results and Results M&E; the Results Chain/Framework which shows the causal sequence for a development intervention to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts and feedback; the GPH Results Framework which shows the evolving national framework for the GPH's results-based performance management system; M&E at the Plan, Sector, Program/Project Level; M&E as part of the planning cycle; M&E in the Project Framework; importance of learning and different types of evaluation.

He finally provided the participants with an overview of the NEDA-DBM Joint Memorandum Circular No. 2015-01 (The National Evaluation Policy Framework of the Philippines) or the framework for the purposive conduct of evaluations in the public sector in support of good governance, transparency, accountability and evidence-based decision-making – its objectives, coverage, process of crafting, guiding principles and evaluation standards, major players and responsibilities, major challenges such as the varying levels of evaluation capacities (competencies and skills) across agencies, limited budget to conduct evaluations, and setting up of evaluation unit and the government's next steps.

*Session 2: Understanding Monitoring and Evaluation*

Mr. Rey O. Macalindong explained the key concepts and principles of project planning, project implementation and control, and project operation and how these link to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). He also discussed the project implementation problems, issues, and difficulties, and how these can be addressed by M&E.

In understanding M&E, Mr. Macalindong also discussed the M&E design considerations and common mistakes and misconceptions in M&E work. Putting emphasis on the importance of the M&E's scope, he shared that our first mental image of M&E is that it is all about reports to be submitted, forms & templates, and tools and, often, the quality of the M&E system is dictated by the quality of reports. However, he clarified that while quality of a report is necessary, it is far more important to understand first the scope of the M&E. He warned the participants not to develop data gathering templates or forms without clarifying the M&E scope as it will result to unnecessary collection of data and information. Similarly, preparing the evaluation tools without considering the scope of the evaluation will subject projects and programs to wrong measures.

Other design considerations include: 2) taking into account the good and bad news, the issues and constraints, the barriers and bottlenecks which are all important inputs to decision-making; determining the decision-making requirements and accountabilities and making sure that the implementers' decision-making and information needs are considered first before the stakeholders' because it is the implementers who have direct accountability; 4) ensuring that the key M&E concept: Hierarchy of Objectives or Hierarchy of Results is correct and logical; 5) putting emphasis on the significant few critical metrics than collecting too much information and data; 6) considering an event as a platform for decision-making; 7) using different M&E tools for different contexts; 8) linking M&E to planning because data, findings, insights, results of analysis are input to decision-making; 9) timing; 10) vertical and horizontal design in which there is strategic feedback which will allow for more responsive policies, strategies and programs; 11) tracking of the macro and micro external factors such as barriers or the things beyond control and changes in the environment (physical, economic, political, etc); 12) changing people's perspectives on M&E.

He then provided the advantages and disadvantages of conducting M&E and discussed the monitoring and evaluation cycle: defining M&E scope which includes clarifying the objectives, targets and strategies; setting up M&E system or defining the verification process including strategies and resources needed to operationalize the system; monitoring or tracking the implementation progress including identification of and addressing barriers and bottlenecks; and evaluation and adjustments wherein major milestones and/or achievements versus desired objectives and targets are assessed.

*Session 3: Designing a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*

In this session, Mr. Rey O. Macalindong identified the major tools and techniques for every M&E activity as well as their importance and usage. For *Scoping*, the tools and techniques to be used are Logical Framework Matrix, Work and Financial Plan, Dashboard, Segmentation; for *Data Collection*: M&E Forms and Database, Documents, Issue Log, Rapid Appraisal Technique, Process Documentation, Most Significant Change Technique and Surveys and Questionnaires; for *Analysis*: Performance Measures, Cause & Effect Analysis, SWOT Analysis, Segmentation Analysis, CEA/CBA, With & Without Project

Approach and Quasi Experimental Approach; and lastly, for *Presentation*: tables and graphs, data maps and pictures. When selecting tools and techniques, he reminded the participants to select the right tools for the right situation, to be sure that they know the tools and techniques to be used because incorrect usage of the right tools will provide the wrong answers, and to complement the selected tools with other techniques.

He then introduced the Logical Framework Matrix or Logframe to the participants as a planning, monitoring and evaluation tool, and provided its background, key concepts and principles. When constructing the logframe, he stressed the five key questions to consider – for the first column, 'What are we trying to accomplish and why?' *(Objectives)*; for the second column: 'How will we measure success?' *(Indicators)*; for the third column: 'How do we validate the accomplishments / achievements?' *(Means of Verification)*; for the fourth column: 'What other conditions must exist?' *(External factors)*; and lastly, 'What do we need?' *(Resources)*. He provided some logframe samples for the participants to further grasp the topic.

When conducting surveys and questionnaires, one of the commonly used data collection tools, he reminded the participants to take into account the following: 1) Who will be answering the questions? 2) How much time will the respondents be willing to spend? 3) How many respondents will be involved? and 4) How much is known about the possible answers, and if they want to provide the answers to the respondents. He also reminded them not to overuse surveys, to allocate sufficient time and resources for their development and pilot-testing, to consider using various kinds of questions, to only ask the 'need-to-know' and limit the 'need-to-know' questions and to consider using electronic surveys when appropriate to reduce data collection and data entry time and costs.

In his discussion on tools for analysis, he provided some tips that the participants can use when doing a problem analysis: to be sure that they have complete data – both primary and secondary sources, watch out for vague statements, avoid judgmental statements or criticisms, beware of solutions masquerading as problems, show where the problems occur, and complement problem analysis with other approaches/tools. Finally, when presenting evaluation of findings, he reminded the participants to present in a very insightful manner and to focus on the essentials.

After the lecture, the participants were given time to prepare their own logframes to be presented and critiqued by Mr. Macalindong the following day.

*Session 4: Progress Monitoring and Evaluation*

After the recap of Sessions 2 and 3, Mr. Rey O. Macalindong provided some background of the Progress M&E – a systematic and objective assessment of an on-going implementation of a plan, program or project, aimed at provide timely and accurate information to decision makers to steer implementation as efficiently as possible. This type of M&E, he shared, enables decision-makers, managers and staff to compare planned and actual performance (example, actual accomplishment versus planned targets, efficiency in use of resources, and actual expenditures versus budget), to assess quality of services and products delivered, detect and minimize scope creep, appraise staff performance based on outputs delivered, and make corrective actions and adjustments on the targets, time/schedule, resources and budget.

He stressed that the absence of an M&E system in a program or project results to, first, the loss of ability to think outside the box. He explained that there is a general tendency for planners and implementers to always pursue the "tried and tested" programs simply because they already have developed the "expertise." But the absence of information, insights and feedback generated from an M&E system takes its toll to implementers and leads to same programs with the same problems. Secondly, strategic planning is undertaken without really looking back and assessing what went well and what went wrong. M&E system's absence also results to late response to operational issues and difficulties, too many data and/or overemphasis to data gathering and field work which usually results to data graveyard, and lastly, inefficient usage of resources.

He then identified Progress M&E's seven principles: the plan being the standard by which implementation will be compared or measured against; very rarely things will go as planned so there has to be a mechanism that will provide implementers with early warning signals; importance of timing in progress monitoring during periods where critical decisions are made; adjustment of activities, resources, time and cost so as to to steer implementation towards the desired outcomes; managing and/or minimizing scope creeps; and recurring problems and issues addressed by review points. This was followed by the discussion of the guideposts when doing Progress M&E, its inputs (Program Design, Implementing Guidelines, Work and Financial Plan, Indicators, cost requirements and cash flow) and outputs (Performance Measurement, Narrative Report, and Catch-up Plan).

Finally, the participants were given the time to refine their logframes that will serve as inputs to the M&E Plan that they will be presenting during the training's last day.

*Presentation and Critiquing of Project Logframe*

A total of five (5) groups of participants from different LGUs volunteered to present their logframes in the afternoon.

The LGU of Pinamalayan proposed a project for the construction of a pump-driven level II water supply system. Mr. Macalindong commented the following: before they can start a project or implement activities, the identified important assumptions (example, additional funds for project expansion and project funds released as planned) should be met first and for them to be able to deliver the outputs on time; if there is a right of way and deeds of donation, then they can start the project; once the outputs have been completed, then the set purpose, that is, safe and potable water supply system, will be achieved; and there is little difference between their identified Goal (clean water and sanitation) and Purpose (safe and potable water supply system).

Similarly, the LGU of Marikina City proposed a Doña Petra Water Supply Project to improve the quality of life of the residents in Doña Petra housing site as its Goal. It was suggested that they revise their indicators as some were not consistent, and appeared as "outputs"; revisit their Purpose "enjoyable" water services supply as their purpose make the Goal more expansive in the entire LGU, referring to Marikina City; revise the indicator "happy and contented" residents because we are still looking for the happiness index indicators; and make the Outputs detailed and make them an implementation plan.

The Provincial Government of Agusan del Sur proposed a project entitled "K to 3 Educational Development Projects in Upland Communities". According to Mr. Macalindong, the identified goal did not talk about children but more on the community. He also commented that census should be conducted as one of its activities; there were too many identified outputs; "formulated" and "published" as indicators should be separated as well as the indicators per output; to refine the indicators of the purpose; and to exclude "environment" from the assumptions because it is already given.

The City Governments of Muntinlupa and Manila would like to provide scholarships or financial assistance to High School students who are unable to enter college. Mr. Macalindong commented on the LGU's goal "improved quality of life of indigent families" – that target group must be identified. In the OVIs of the Purpose (example, increase college graduate indigent students by 10% in 2019), he told the group that it could have been better if they indicated "from X to X". Other suggestions of Mr. Macalindong are: provision of breakdown in the number of graduates per year in the OVIs since there will be different entries; replacing the term "provided" with "received" or "availed" in the Output statement "5,981 indigent families provided with start-up capital by 2019"; itemize the training (can be per batch or per year) in the OVIs.

Lastly, the LGUs from Laguna (PLGU Laguna, City Governments of San Pablo, Cabuyao, and San Pedro) proposed a project for a climate-resilient and climate change-adaptive (CCA) lakeshore community. Mr. Macalindong noted that the group should revisit their Goal and Purpose and commented that in their Purpose's OVI "Lakeshore residents' climate change-adaptive capacity increased because of campaign and annual income increased from PHP X to PHP X because of additional income-generating options", the indicator should not necessarily be the "income". He also suggested that the group should be more specific on the type of hazard, disaster, etc. in their Goal's OVI. Lastly, he suggested changing their Goal to Purpose.

*Session 5: Results Monitoring and Evaluation*

Mr. Clement L. Rasul's discussion centered on the different tools and techniques used in Results Monitoring and Evaluation: Quantitative Methods which make use of Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) and Ratio and Proportions when describing data and Random Sampling and Student's t-Test when generalizing data; Qualitative Methods which make use of Focus Group Discussion and Most Significant Change (MSC) Technique which was previously discussed by Mr. Macalindong; for collecting data, the use of Random Sampling; Pre and Post Approach which bases the gain from the difference between the post and pre-test through the use of statistical significance (t-Test); With and Without Approach; Target versus Forecast of Projection; Forecasting using the different Naïve Methods (Arithmetic Mean Method, Arithmetic Straight Line, and Arithmetic Geometric Curve) as well as determining which forecasting method to use.

Mr. Rasul then elaborated on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation and other related concepts such as Participatory Evaluation (PE), Participatory Monitoring (PM), Participatory Assessment, Monitoring, and Evaluation (PAME), Participatory Impact Monitoring (PIM), Process Monitoring (ProM), Self-Evaluation (SE), Auto-Evaluation, Stakeholder-based Evaluation/Stakeholder Assessment and Community Monitoring/Citizen Monitoring (CM). Lastly, he differentiated Conventional from and Participatory Evaluation.

Before the end of the session, the participants were asked to complete two case exercises, (one was about a pilot barangay household potable water project, and the other one was about province-wide cacao farming) by determining the Results M&E objective of the project, the questions that need to be answered to determine its effectiveness, the detailed methodology and/or instruments used to determine the results of the project (sampling, procedure, frequency, methods), and the specific data that need to be collected to monitor the project's results.

*Session 6: Monitoring and Evaluation Work Program*

In this session, Mr. Clement L. Rasul briefly discussed the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and connected it with other topics covered earlier such as Progress M&E, Results M&E, Progress M&E Participatory M&E and M&E System. He also stressed that in an M&E Plan, it is important to determine the scope or coverage, the schedules and timelines, the organization levels, the tasking and responsibilities, the users, and why the implementer would undertake M&E of the particular area or as what he called it, "making sense of the M&E work". Finally, Mr. Rasul explained Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) or the detailed composition of the Outputs, Sub-outputs, and Activities, followed by a workshop on the development of a Detailed M&E Matrix.

*Session 7: Communicating and Reporting Monitoring and Evaluation Results*

Ms. Adelina H. Velasco's session, aimed at helping the participants understand the role and importance of M&E in decision-making and the use of M&E data in improving program and project interventions and presenting M&E results using different and appropriate formats for target audience, centered on the main considerations in communicating and reporting M&E results and in structuring and packaging the report.

When communicating M&E results, she emphasized the importance of taking into account what the questions are, who is/are asking, why they are asking and when do they need the answers because reports contain "messages" that are intended for specific audience. She furthered that people or agencies that placed a large "stake" in the program are the ones that will ask for results, either at the progress level or outcome level. She also shared that the implementers should create a Matrix of Stakeholders vis-à-vis the questions with corresponding data requirements and/or indicators per question and to rationalize these questions (and data requirements and/or indicators) to create a "master list" which will serve as: 1) input in designing the M&E database; and 2) directory for creating M&E reports.

When proving the validity and integrity of the results, she noted that M&E process following standards of research must be defined and must be articulated when appropriate, but most importantly, when evaluating reports. These results, she explained, can be best understood if the following criteria are met: 1) Well-structured and complete; 2) what is being evaluated and why, is described; 3) questions of concerns to users are identified; 4) the steps and the procedures used to answer those questions are explained; 5) findings supported by credible evidence in response to questions are presented; 6) limitations are acknowledged; conclusions about findings based on evidence are drawn; 7) concrete and usable recommendations are proposed; and 8) criteria are written with the report user.

Finally, when packaging the report, Ms. Velasco suggested the following format (derived from the National Evaluation Policy Framework of the Philippines) – use the prescribed instruments of oversight agencies; Technical Report form; Brief Report containing Physical Accomplishments and Backlogs and Financial Status and Issues; Lessons Learned; and Recommendations.

*Presentation of Outputs*

A total of seven (7) groups of participants from different LGUs presented their Detailed M&E Matrix, which, consists of Narrative Summary, Objectively Verifiable Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Methods or Instruments, Target Group, Frequency or Timing, Responsible Unit, and Report.

The LGUs of Oroquieta City, Island Garden of Samal, Lamitan City, and Cebu City, proposed a project that aims to reduce the cost of disposed garbage in Cebu City. The panel members, Mr. Clement L. Rasul and Ms. Adelina H. Velasco, provided the following comments and suggestions:

- The purpose should be the "reduction of the volume of wastes".
- The matrix lacks component on the waste segregation at the household level.
- Educating the barangays on how to properly segregate wastes can be another component (sub-output).
- Create a stimulus for the private sector to come in, i.e. Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) mode of partnership. Private sector can operate the MRF.
- MRF facility in this case should not be an output. Leased contract to the private sector is a valid output.
- Evaluation questions should be neutral – do not put assumptions. Ask what the changes are, instead of the conditions. Example:
  - What are the necessary changes in the sanitary conditions of the city?

  The answer should not only indicate "improved or did not improve" but also set indicators to determine the changes, such as "no smell or reduction of air-borne diseases".
  - How do you measure the cost of garbage? Suggested evaluation question: "What is the change in the cost? The answer could be, for example, from PHP12.00 to PHP10.00.
- Changes should have a baseline and an end line.
- Methods/instruments at the output and input levels can be S-curve output, baseline plan, and Gantt chart instead of the Pre-and Post-Evaluation Approach.

The cities of Muntinlupa, Manila, and Marikina, endeavor to increase educated indigent students in the city by providing scholarships and financial assistance. The panel members suggested the following:

- Indicate the project's duration.
- Clarify if the PME Report is different from the Accomplishment Report. If so, just indicate PME Report.
- Some items indicated in the output level such as trained teachers, conducted livelihood for parents, and provision for start-up capital should be in the input level.
- "Improved quality of life of indigent families" should be higher than Goal. The goal should be the "increase educated indigent students at the city" which is under the purpose level. The purpose can be changed to "Scholars are able to complete college education".
- For the evaluation questions, include questions for efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability for every hierarchy of objectives or for every output in the logframe. Below are the possible questions:
    - Effectiveness: How many teachers were trained within 2018? 2019? Compare based on plan. Did the teachers use their competencies applied or did the teachers use their learned competencies?
    - Efficiency: Did the project train 40 target teachers within 2018? 2019?
    - Relevance: Were the teachers trained based on the required competencies to be able to teach?
    - At the output level, there should be no sustainability question. The sustainability question can be done at the purpose/goal level.

The LGUs of Masbate, Tabaco, Ligao, and San Jose Del Monte's project on minimizing flooding in the affected barangays can be improved, as per the panel members, by reducing "the property damages because of flooding" since their indicated goal is too broad. They also asked what the flood incidence rate is in their purpose's OVI "non-incidence of flooding in the affected barangays". Lastly, they commented that instead of utilizing survey/questionnaire as their method under the purpose level, it may be effective if they can conduct ocular inspection or involve the civil society to monitor (Participatory Monitoring) rather than go to the area during typhoon.

The Provincial Governments of Nueva Vizcaya, Pangasinan, Isabela, Camarines Norte, and Lanao del Sur proposed a project that will increase tourism and economic activities within their area. Mr. Rasul and Ms. Velasco commented that their indicated goal can be related to the tax revenue of the LGU, thus, in the report generated, they may indicate financial analysis and revenue reports. With regard to evaluation questions, they suggested the following: "What is the change in the revenue after three years of the project?", "Did it meet the target increase?", "Was there a change in the revenue within three years after the project has been completed?", "How high or how low?", and "What is the trend in the change of tourist arrivals?" (Sustainability). Both of them have noticed that the goal and purpose statements of the group are the same. At the purpose level, they suggested that the group may indicate tourism-related professionals and to put "employment indicators" in the OVI. Lastly, the panel members suggested the group to think of another measure of tourist arrivals aside from the logbook of the visitors.

Project Impact:

The presentations of the LGUs' project logframes and Detailed M&E Matrix showed that the training was able to provide the participants with the knowledge and equip them with skills on project monitoring and evaluation. Although there were some points for improvement identified by the panel members during the presentation of outputs, the participants were able to capture what should be included in a logical framework and in the M&E Matrix. Some of them would also need to refine their formulated evaluation questions, Goal and Purpose, and the corresponding OVIs, but all in all, they were able to grasp the logic behind the construction of a logframe and an M&E Plan.

They were also able to identify key issues in their localities, projects that would help address those problems, as well as methods on how their projects can be monitored and evaluated. Generally, the LGUs were able to present good outputs as observed by the panel members. They also expressed their positive views on the conduct of this training in the course evaluation forms, in their social media posts, and messages sent to the program manager after the training.

Overall, the participants gave positive feedback on the training with an average rating of 4.08 for the course evaluation (*see attachment 1*). They gave the highest rating to usefulness of course, 4.34, followed by course objectives, 4.32, exercises, 4.19 and appropriateness of instruction materials, 4.19. The participants found the learnings they acquired through the workshops and expertise of the resource persons as particularly rewarding about the course.

The participants also gave relatively high ratings for the resource persons with 4.66, 4.58, 4.55 and 3.36 for Mr. Macalindong, Ms. Velasco, Mr. Rasul, and Mr. David, respectively. They found the extensive knowledge and experience of the resource persons as their positive points.

Lessons Learned:

The following are the lessons learned from the preparation to the implementation of the training:

1. Weekly follow-up and reminders to the participants to settle the payment and accomplish the Participant Information Sheet (PIS) prior the training's conduct helped in securing the course fees ahead. This helped in the smooth registration process during the first day of the training. Long queue of participants who needed to pay on the first day was also avoided.
2. Expectations Checking Activity regarding the Course, Training Team, Resource Persons, Co-Participants, and Logistics should be done prior the conduct of the actual training. The Training Team may send a form thru email asking for these details weeks prior the on-site training.
3. There were too many participants who attended the training. The target number of participants for this course, 35, was overly exceeded since the number of participants who actually attended was 76. Few days prior its actual conduct, there were still a lot of LGU officers and staff who would like to enroll though they had already been informed that the class was already full. In addition, during the training itself, there were also walk-in participants who attended. This resulted to the following:
   a. The resource persons found it difficult to manage learning and were not able to fully discuss some of the sessions.
   b. It was difficult for some of the participants to move around the venue.
   c. The notes/writings of the resource persons on the whiteboard are not visible at the distance.

   The team may include in the guidelines sent to the participants prior the training that a) the Academy reserves the right not to accept walk-ins if the number of target participants has already been reached and b) they are officially registered to the course only if they have settled the course fee a week prior the training's conduct.

## V. Attachments

- Summary of Evaluation for Course and Resource Person (for training program)

**Prepared by:**

Bernadette D. Rodriguez
Project Manager

**Noted / Approved by:**

Imelda C. Caluen
Center Head

Notes:

1. Project details on Section I-III can be generated thru PMIS based on PMs Inputs.
2. Project Managers are required to accomplish Section IV & provide Section V to reflect results of project implementation
3. Project Managers can update/adjust the pre-filled sections(I-III) based on actual data