



The Temporal Gap Between Evaluation and Monitoring: Re-thinking the Design of M&E Systems

Boniface Francis Kalanda

1. University of Malawi, Chancellor College, Zomba, Malawi

Abstract: Evaluation is widely recognized as a critical tool for accountability and strategic learning. Yet evaluations are infrequent, retrospective, and resource-intensive. In my cases, by the time findings are available, organizations often have already adapted based on real-time monitoring data. This paper argues that while evaluations remain indispensable for long-term impact assessment and external accountability, monitoring processes are the primary drivers of organizational learning in practice. Drawing on literature from programme evaluation, organizational learning, and adaptive management, the paper highlights the temporal gap between evaluation and monitoring. It explores case examples from development, education, and health sectors, and proposes a reframing of evaluation's role in contemporary organizations. The analysis concludes that monitoring drives real-time adaptation, while evaluation provides retrospective validation, and that organizations must integrate both to maximize learning

Keywords: Evaluation, Monitoring, Organizational Learning, course corrections, real-time.

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks have become central to organizational practice in development, education, and health sectors (OECD, 2010; USAID, 2016). These systems are designed to generate evidence, guide decision-making, and ensure accountability to stakeholders. Despite their shared purpose, monitoring and evaluation differ fundamentally in their timing, scope, and utility. Evaluation is episodic, retrospective, and methodologically rigorous, while monitoring is continuous, formative, and embedded in daily operations (Patton, 2012; Kusek & Rist, 2004).

This paper addresses a temporal paradox between monitoring and evaluations. Although evaluations are widely regarded as the gold standard for learning and accountability, organizations often learn faster from monitoring. By the time evaluation results are disseminated, staff have, in many cases, adapted practices based on monitoring data. This temporal gap raises critical questions about the role of evaluation in organizational learning. Should evaluation continue to be prioritized as the primary source of knowledge, or should monitoring be recognized as the main driver of adaptation?

The paper contributes to this debate by synthesizing literature on evaluation, monitoring, and organizational learning, presenting case examples, and proposing a reframing of evaluation's role. It argues that monitoring drives real-time learning, while evaluation provides retrospective validation and strategic reflection. The analysis has implications for funders, policymakers, and practitioners seeking to design effective M&E systems.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evaluation

Historically, evaluation emerged as a tool for accountability, particularly in public policy and international development (Weiss, 1998, Scriven, 1991). Evaluations are typically summative, conducted at the end of a project cycle, and designed to answer questions of causality and impact (Patton, 2012). Their strengths include accountability, rigor, and strategic learning. However, evaluations are constrained by their timing. They are often conducted months or years after interventions have matured. Evaluation findings are disseminated long after organizations have, in many cases, already adapted their programmes based on monitoring results (Chelimsky, 1997; Rogers, 2008).

Monitoring

Monitoring, by contrast, is the continuous collection of data on inputs, processes, and outputs (Kusek & Rist, 2004). It is formative, embedded in daily operations, and provides immediate feedback. Monitoring is valued for timeliness, adaptability, and operational relevance (OECD, 2010). Advances in digital dashboards, mobile data collection, and real-time analytics have strengthened monitoring systems (World Bank, 2017; UNICEF, 2019). These systems enable organizations to detect problems early and adapt quickly, often rendering evaluation findings less actionable by the time they are released (Gullotta et al., 2025).

Organizational Learning

Organizational learning theory emphasizes feedback loops and adaptive processes (Argyris & Schon, 1978). Monitoring aligns closely with these principles, enabling organizations to learn in real time. Evaluations, while valuable, often lag behind organizational adaptation. Argyris and Schon (1978) distinguish between single-loop learning (adjusting actions based on feedback) and double-loop learning (questioning underlying assumptions). Monitoring supports single-loop learning, while evaluation supports double-loop learning. Both are necessary, but monitoring often drives the actual process of adaptation (Senge, 1990; Fiol & Lyles, 1985; Levitt & March, 1988; ScienceDirect, 2022; Redalyc, 2023).

METHODOLOGY

This paper employs a conceptual analysis approach. It synthesizes existing literature and examples from development, education, and health sectors. The aim is not to present new empirical data. It is to critically examine temporal dynamics of evaluation and monitoring. Case examples are drawn from secondary sources. These include published evaluations, monitoring reports, and organizational studies. The analysis is grounded in organizational learning theory and adaptive management frameworks (Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2011).

Examples

Development Programmes

In international development, monitoring indicators such as school attendance or supply chain delays often trigger corrective actions long before evaluation reports are published. For example, UNICEF education programmes frequently adjust distribution strategies based on real-time monitoring of attendance data (UNICEF, 2019). Similarly, World Bank projects use monitoring dashboards to track implementation progress, enabling mid-course corrections (World Bank, 2017). Evaluations conducted years later may confirm these adaptations. While this confirmation is important, the learning has already occurred through monitoring (Bamberger, Rugh, & Mabry, 2016; Bamberger & Segone, 2011).

Education Systems

School districts in the United States and elsewhere rely heavily on formative assessments and real-time monitoring of student performance data. Teachers adjust instructional strategies based on monitoring data. This is as often as once a week or once a month. Evaluations of curriculum effectiveness, conducted years later, may confirm or challenge these adaptations. These confirmations are important for programme adjustment. However, the learning has already occurred through monitoring (Preskill & Boyle, 2008).

Health Programmes

Health interventions, particularly in HIV/AIDS programmes, rely on real-time monitoring of drug adherence and patient outcomes. Monitoring data enables immediate corrective action. For example, adjusting treatment protocols or addressing supply chain issues is based on monitoring data. Evaluations conducted years later provide valuable insights into long-term impact, but the immediate learning has already occurred through monitoring (WHO, 2015).

A TEMPORAL GAP

Based on the example above, this paper identifies a temporal yet structural gap in the design of monitoring and evaluation systems. Evaluations, while instrumental in driving learning, suffer from a temporal gap. By the time evaluation findings are disseminated, staff have already adjusted practices based on monitoring data. In addition, external conditions may have shifted. This reduces the relevance of evaluation insights. Most critical, also, is that by the time evaluation results are ready, organizational memory may have moved on. This in itself limits the uptake of recommendations.

This gap diminishes the practical utility of evaluations for immediate decision-making, positioning monitoring as the primary driver of organizational learning. The paradox is that evaluations are rigorous but often obsolete by the time they arrive (Chelimsky, 1997; Rogers, 2008).

DISCUSSION

The tension between evaluation and monitoring suggests several implications for practice and theory. Evaluations should incorporate monitoring data to remain relevant. This is already done in many organizations and in many evaluations. The implication, however, is

that monitoring data should be collected with evaluations in mind. By triangulating evaluation findings with monitoring data, organizations can ensure that evaluations reflect current realities (OECD, 2010). Development organizations should prioritize real-time learning systems. Monitoring should be recognized as the primary driver of adaptation, with evaluation serving as a complementary tool for strategic reflection (USAID, 2016). In such away, appropriate investments will be made in monitoring. Monitoring should be much higher up in the radar of management than it is now.

Evaluations should focus on strategic questions that monitoring cannot answer. These questions include long-term impact and causality. Rather than merely complementing (sometimes even competing with) monitoring, evaluations should address questions that require retrospective analysis (Patton, 2012). Further, rapid evaluation methods, such as developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011), may help bridge the gap. These approaches emphasize real-time feedback and adaptation, aligning evaluation more closely with monitoring.

Donors and management of development organizations should shift expectations from evaluation-only to monitoring-driven learning. By recognizing the value of monitoring, donors can support organizations in building adaptive monitoring systems that prioritize real-time learning (Gullotta et al., 2025).

CONCLUSION

Evaluations remain essential for accountability and strategic learning. However, their infrequency, cost, and retrospective nature limit their utility for immediate decision-making. Monitoring, by contrast, provides continuous feedback that enables organizations to learn and adapt in real time. While evaluations contribute to knowledge accumulation, monitoring often drives the actual process of organizational learning. A reframing of evaluation's role is needed. Evaluation should be positioned as complementary to monitoring rather than as the primary source of organizational learning. Such a position will determine management emphasis and investments in systems of monitoring and evaluation.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- [2]. Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., & Mabry, L. (2016). *RealWorld evaluation: Working under budget, time, data, and political constraints*. SAGE Publications.
- [3]. Bamberger, M., & Segone, M. (2011). *How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations*. UNICEF Evaluation Office.
- [4]. Chelimsky, E. (1997). The coming transformations in evaluation. In E. Chelimsky & W. R. Shadish (Eds.), *Evaluation for the 21st century* (pp. 1-26). SAGE Publications.
- [5]. Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M. A. (2011). *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management*. Wiley.
- [6]. Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 803-813. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4279103> (doi.org in Bing)

-
- [7]. Gullotta, G., Jersild, A., Negroustoueva, S., & Templeton, D. (2025). Summary of learnings on monitoring, evaluation, learning and impact assessments (MELIA). CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service.
- [8]. Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004). Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system. World Bank.
- [9]. Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 319-340. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.14.080188.001535> (doi.org in Bing)
- [10]. OECD. (2010). Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management. OECD Publishing.
- [11]. Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. Guilford Press.
- [12]. Patton, M. Q. (2012). *Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation*. SAGE Publications.
- [13]. Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A multidisciplinary model of evaluation capacity building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 443-459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214008324182> (doi.org in Bing)
- [14]. Redalyc. (2023). A systematic review of the organizational learning and performance literature. *Revista Científica Visión de Futuro*, 27(1), 24-39.
- [15]. Rogers, P. J. (2008). Using programme theory to evaluate complicated and complex aspects of interventions. *Evaluation*, 14(1), 29-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389007084674> (doi.org in Bing)
- [16]. Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus*. SAGE Publications.
- [17]. ScienceDirect. (2022). Organisational learning, learning organisation, and learning orientation: An integrative review and framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100854> (doi.org in Bing)
- [18]. Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
- [19]. UNICEF. (2019). *Education monitoring and evaluation framework*. UNICEF.
- [20]. USAID. (2016). *ADS Chapter 203: Assessing and learning*. USAID.
- [21]. Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies*. Prentice Hall.
- [22]. WHO. (2015). *Monitoring and evaluation of health systems strengthening*. World Health Organization.
- [23]. World Bank. (2017). *Results-based financing in education: Monitoring and evaluation lessons*. World Bank Publications.