



DFID
Department for International Development

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

Summary of a Report of a Workshop on

Participatory Monitoring and Assessment of Technologies

August 27th - 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
2.0 : Participation	1
3.0 : Workshop Objectives.	2
3.1 a : Overall Objective of Module I (Participatory)	2
3.1b : Learning Objective of Module I	2
3.2 a : Overall Objective of Module II (Discussion on Client-Oriented Research)	2
3.2 b : Learning Objectives of Module II	2
3.3 : Overall Objective of Module III (Review of Economic Analysis of Technologies)	3
3.4 : Learning Objective of Module IV (Review of Qualitative Aspects of Technologies)	3
3.5 : Learning Objective of Module V (Participatory Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation)	3
3.6 a : Teaching Objective of Module VI (Developing tools for Monitoring and Evaluation)	3
3.6 b : Learning Objectives of Module VI	3
4.0 : Workshop Output.....	3
5.0 : Workshop Challenges	4
6.0 : Participants' General comments about the workshop	4

1.0 : Introduction

This is a summary of a report for a training workshop on “Participatory Monitoring and Assessment of Technologies” sponsored by the NARO/DFID Client-Oriented Agricultural Research and Dissemination (COARD) Project. The workshop was part of the project’s capacity building programme targeting several categories of beneficiaries including scientists, extensionists, private sector and development workers. The workshop took place at the Sunset Hotel International, Jinja.

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

2.0 : Participation

Twenty-eight participants attended the workshop. They were drawn from various organizations and departments as shown in Table 2.0a (below).

Table 2.0a : Participants Profiles.

NAME	ORGANIZATION/DEPARTMENT
Ejobi . F	Makerere University
Isyagi Nelly	Kajjansi Research Station
Busolo – Bulafu	SAARI
Obuo J.F.P	SAARI
Elobu Pius	SAARI
Epieru George	SAARI
Edward Ssewanyana	SAARI
Emeetai – Areke T.E	SAARI
Alex Turrall	SAARI
Walter Anyanga	SAARI
Opio Nelson Peter	Production Department (APAC)
Opio Apuet J.K	Production Department (PALLISA)
Ochodio Michael	Production Department (PALLISA)
Aluka Pauline	CORI, MUKONO
Ogwang A. Magdalene	Cow Pea Project, SOROTI
Mbalule Moses	FORRI
Ebiyau Johnie	(Soroti)
Okiror Ande	Vision TERUDO
Okoth J.O	COVECO (Tororo)
Ecwinyu Stephen	MATILONG (Soroti)
Auta Deogratus	(Soroti)
Esolu Charles	Bululu MSC Ltd (Soroti)

Nsubuga – Mutaka Robert	ARDC (Mbarara)
Akello Lucy	ORIBING WCS&C (Lira)
Illango James	LIRI
Niringiye Charles	NAARI
Agitta Elizabeth Okotchi	RIDF (Lira)
Adupa Robert	AT (Uganda)

3.0 : Workshop Objectives.

The training had 6 modules each of which had its own objectives..

3.1 a : Overall Objective of Module I (Participatory)

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

3.1b : Learning Objective of Module I

To enable Participants define the term “participatory” and explain its purpose in research, monitoring, evaluation and dissemination of technologies.

3.2 a : Overall Objective of Module II (Discussion on Client-Oriented Research)

To enable Participants describe client, client-oriented research and apply participatory approaches in monitoring and assessment of technologies.

3.2 b : Learning Objectives of Module II

To enable Participants to define and explain the meaning of;

- Client
- Client-oriented research
- Participatory technology development (i.e. how participatory technology development as well as dissemination work including the roles and responsibilities of clients and researchers).

3.3 : Overall Objective of Module III (Review of Economic Analysis of Technologies)

To strengthen the competence of participants in assessing economics of technologies.

3.4 : Learning Objective of Module IV (Review of Qualitative Aspects of Technologies)

To enable participants to identify the qualitative aspects of a technology and explain how those aspects affect the utilization of the technology.

3.5 : Learning Objective of Module V (Participatory Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation)

To enable participants describe the process of participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) and apply some of the approaches to PM&E.

3.6 a : Teaching Objective of Module VI (Developing tools for Monitoring and Evaluation)

To facilitate and guide experientially the participants on the design and critiquing formats, for data and information collection.

3.6 b : Learning Objectives of Module VI

To enable participants to;

- Identify indicators and measurements of different types of research projects;
- Design formats for collecting data; and
- Critique the formats and come up with final tested and usable formats.

4.0 : Workshop Output

The tangible outputs of the workshop included:

- A workshop report which mainly consisted of facilitators' report, teaching notes and rapporteur's report;
- Products of participant's group assignments.

5.0 : Workshop Challenges

- Power failures/blackouts which interrupted participants' activities (both at night and during the day)
- There were several welfare-related complaints which may have had negative effect on participants' morale (e.g. payment of out-of-pocket allowance, meals)
- Some participants complained that the workshop should have been more practical rather than delving into definitions of concepts.
- Some participants observed that the facilitators were not conscious of time.
- Inadequate time hence some participants suggested more time for the workshop (e.g. to redo "development of tools for PM&E").

6.0 : Participants' General comments about the workshop

Positive comments	Negative comments
- Workshop was generally relevant. - Invite us more times. - Generally well done. - The presence of Abigail and Julius (from SAARI) was inspiring. - Purpose of the training is good.	- Participants should be left to decide where to spend the night. - Workshop should be more practical rather than delving into concept definition. - Poor time keeping by facilitators. - Hotel menu (meals) is monotonous. - Revisit development of tools for PM&E - Inadequate allowances. - Venue lacks a suggestion box. - Venue should be shifted farther east. - Final day should be a full day. - Lack of recreation activity at the end of the workshop. - Four days not enough for the workshop. - Some workshop aspects need to be redone. - Some workshop members enjoy better hotel facilities than others.

