In-country Training Program for the Stakeholders of the NARO/DFID COARD Project

NARO

DFID
Department for International Development

Summary of a Report of a Workshop on

Participatory Monitoring and Assessment of Technologies

(Workshop No. 2)

November 26th - 30th 2001



Prepared and Implemented by:

IMPACT Associates
DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS
43 Lumumba Avenue Kampala. UGANDA.
Tel: 256-41-234686/231583 **Fax:** 256-41- 347054
Email: *info@impactassociates.co.ug*

AGRO-TECH CONSULTANCY LTD
Faculty of Agriculture
Makerere University
P. O. BOX 7062, KAMPALA
UGANDA
TEL: 256-41-533580/620
Email: kyamanywa@starcom.co.ug

Table of Contents

1.0 : Introduction. 1

1.1 : Workshop Participation. 1

1.2 : Workshop Objectives. 2

1.2.1 : Overall Objective. 2

1.2.2 : Specific Objectives. 3

1.3 : Workshop Outputs. 4

1.4 : Workshop Challenges 4

1.5 : Workshop Overall Evaluation 5

1.0 : Introduction.

This is a summary of a report for a second workshop on "Participatory Monitoring and Assessment of Technologies" which was conducted from 26th to 30th November 2001 at the Sunset Hotel in Jinja. The workshop was one in a series of the NARO/DFID COARD Project training workshops implemented by Agrotech Consultancy and IMPACT Associates.

The workshop was in two parts; the main workshop for participants who had never attended the COARD Project PM&AT training workshop and a one-day workshop for those who attended the first PM&AT workshop but were re-called for one extra day to develop formats for collection of monitoring and evaluation data.

The summary outlines the following aspects of the workshop: participation, objectives, outputs, challenges and results of the workshop evaluation by participants.

1.1 : Workshop Participation.

Twenty two participants attended the first workshop while 16 attended the second. They were drawn from various NARO institutes and private and public institutions as shown in Tables 1.1a and 1.1b, respectively (below).

Table 1.1a : Organisational/Departmental Representation at the main workshop.

	Name	Organization	Designation
1	Ochan James Roland	SAARI, NARO	Technician
2	Aggrey Adrale	ACAV – Soroti	
3	Owori Constance	KARI, NARO	Research Officer
4	Opio Micheal	SOCADIDO	
5	Olupot Henry, I.	Soroti District	Extension Officer
6	Emuria Paul	Soroti District	Agricultural Officer
7	Okiror Deogratias	Soroti District	Agricultural Officer
8	Janet A. Osege	Kumi District	Agricultural Officer
9	Nalapa Martha	Pallisa District	Entomoligist
10	Gard Turyamureba	Abi ARDC, NARO	Center Manager
11	Gerald Odong	Pallisa District	Forestry Oficer
12	Robert J. Omadi	SAARI, NARO	
13	W.P. Nalyongo	SAARI, NARO	
14	Okwang D. Amuriat	SAARI, NARO	
15	Joseph Kibuye Masaba	SAARI, NARO	

16	Dr. Paul Osele F.	Kumi District Farmers Association (KUDFA)	
17	Christine Olaunah	SAARI, NARO	Socio-economist
18	Dr. T. Arach	NRO, Lira	Research Officer
19	Herbert Okurut-Akol	Serere ARDC, NARO	
20	Grace Abigaba	FORRI, NARO	Research Officer
21	Francis O. Alacho	NARO Secretariat	Senior Research officer
22	Dr. Benson Odongo	NAARI, NARO	

Table 1.1b: Organisational and Departmental Representation at 2nd workshop.

	Name	Organisation	Designation
1	Dr. George Epieru	SAARI	Senior Research Officer
2	Dr. Thomas Areke	SAARI	Senior Research Officer
3	Mr. Robert Ecwinyu	Matilong Soroti	Training Officer
4	Mr. Nelson Peter Opio	District Production Dept, Apac	HIO
5	Mr. Josue O. Okoth	COVECO/LIRI	
6	Ms. Lucy Akello	Oribcula, Lira	
7	Ms Aluka Pauline	CORI	Research Officer
8	Mr. Moses Mbalule	Abi ARDC, Arua	Research Officer
9	Ochodio Michael	District Extension, Pallisa	Agricultural Officer
10	Mr. Opio-Apuet J.K	Pallisa District	Fisheries Officer
11	Auta Deogratius	ACAV Soroti	
12	Mr. Esolu Charles	Bululu MCS	Manager
13	Mr. Niringiye Charles	NAARI	Research Officer
14	Ms. Nelly Issyagi	FIRRI, Kajjansi	Research Officer
15	Stella Isodo	Vision Terudo	
16	Magdalene Amujal	Crop Science, Makerere University	

1.2 : Workshop Objectives.

1.2.1 : Overall Objective.

At the end of the workshop, participants would be able to assess and monitor the economic and qualitative aspects of technologies in a participatory manner.

1.2.2 : Specific Objectives.

The workshop was organized into 6 modules each of which had its own learning objectives as shown below:

a) Objectives of Module 1 (Introductions/definitions)

Participants to be able to;

- Define participation and other related terms (farmer participatory research and participatory monitoring and evaluation);
- Explain the purpose of using participatory approaches in research and dissemination of technologies; and
- Describe the basic principles that underpin the concept of participation.

b) Objective of Module 2 (Client-Oriented research)

- Participants to be able to describe and explain a client, client-oriented research and apply participatory approaches in monitoring and assessment of technologies development and dissemination.

c) Objective of Module 3 (Review of Economic Analysis of Technologies)

- To strengthen the competence of participants to assess economics of technologies.

d) Objective of Module 4 (Review of qualitative aspects of technologies)

- Participants to be able to identify qualitative aspects using sample projects and explain how those aspects would affect the project.

e) Objective of Module 5 (Participatory approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation).

At the end of the workshop, participants would be able to;

- Describe the PM&E process; and
- Apply some of the participatory approaches in M&E.

f) Objective of Module 6 (Developing tools for Monitoring &Evaluation)

- Participants to be able to identify indicators of different types of research projects, design formats for collecting data and critique the formats as well as come out with final and usable formats.

1.3 : Workshop Outputs.

Tangible outputs included a workshop report and products of group assignments. According to the facilitators, the most important among the latter outputs are the identified aspects of Participatory Monitoring and the formats designed for collection of monitoring data.

The other workshop outputs are reflected in expressions of participants regarding their specific benefits from the workshop shown in Table 1.3 a (below).

Table 1.3a : Participants' specific benefits from the workshop.

Benefit	No. of Participants
Developing tools for participatory monitoring and evaluation of technologies.	9
Developing indicators for participatory monitoring and evaluation	9
Qualitative assessment of technologies	10
Economic assessment of technologies	11
Meaning of participatory	11

1.4 : Workshop Challenges.

a) Facilitators felt that the time was not sufficient for the enormous load.
b) It was not possible for the facilitators to help every individual to develop formats for collection of monitoring data. Instead a few projects that had already been approved by the COARD Project were focused on during the group work. But even those could not be fine-tuned conclusively.
c) There were fewer participants than had been expected for which there was no explanation.
d) Participants varied widely in that whereas some had projects already approved by the COARD Project, others were still waiting for approval while others were simply potential collaborators.
e) Some participants appeared too attached to the conventional approaches and did not readily receive/subscribe to the use of participatory approaches.
f) Participants who did not have projects appeared generally less enthusiastic about use of participatory approaches apparently because they did not feel immediate need for it.
g) Due to the time constraint it was not possible to use a wide variety of instructional methods which would have added flavour to the training.

h) Some participants had special difficultly understanding some concepts particularly with regard to mathematical manipulations and developing tools for monitoring.
i) Participants made several welfare-related complaints which could have indirectly affected the workshop including:

- Not being allowed to stay in places of their own choice;
- Inconvenience of transport between town and the venue;
- Inconvenience of moving between main hotel and annex; and
- Low out-of-pocket allowance.

1.5 : Workshop Overall Evaluation.

Participants evaluated the workshop on various aspects including, content delivered, method of delivery, participation and time keeping. The rating was done on a five-point scale whereby 5 = Excellent; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good; 2 = Bad; and 1 = Very bad. The outcome is presented in Table 1.5a (Note: Figures against each criterion represent the number of responses/frequencies).

Table 1.5a : Participants Evaluation of the workshop Sessions and facilitators.

Day	Facilitator	Topic/Theme	Criteria	Scale				
				5	4	3	2	1
1	Mr. Paul Kibwika	Introduction and Definitions	Content delivered	5	10	3		
			Method of delivery	3	9	6		
			Participation	2	11	6		
			Time keeping	-	9	8	1	
	Dr. A.R. Semana	Client Oriented Research	Content delivered	3	8	7		
			Method of delivery	-	7	9	1	
			Participation	1	8	8	1	
			Time keeping	1	4	9	2	
2	Dr. J. Mugisha	Economic Assessment of Technologies	Content delivered	7	8	4		
			Method of delivery	1	11	8		
			Participation	1	12	6		
			Time keeping	3	8	7		
3	Mr. Paul Kibwika	Qualitative assessment of Technologies and PM&E	Content delivered	10	5	4		
			Method of delivery	5	9	5		

			Participation	4	10	5		
			Time keeping	5	6	8		
	Dr. Semana	Developing tools for PM&E	Content delivered	4	9	5		
			Method of delivery	4	4	10		
			Participation	3	6	8		
			Time keeping	1	7	10		
4	Dr. Semana	Developing tools for PM&E (Continued)	Content delivered	4	10	6		
			Method of delivery	4	5	9		
			Participation	2	13	3	1	
			Time keeping	5	5	10		

Participants also evaluated the venue of the workshop as well as its administration. The results are presented in Table 1.5 b (below).

Table 1.5 b : Participants Evaluation of workshop facilities and administration.

	Excellent	V. Good	Good	Bad	V. bad
Accommodation	6	7	6		
Feeding (meals)	2	8	9		
Allowances and reimbursements	2	1	8	6	1
Coordination and administration	2	5	11	1	