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<tr>
<td>UN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
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<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
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ABSTRACT

The study focused on examining the key determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects in Nairobi. The study in particular explored how the project plan, project technical capacity, project enabling environment and stakeholder’s participation in monitoring and evaluation influence the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. Before the study was commissioned, the only material that was available and relating to monitoring and evaluation was in the form of manuals, guidelines, policies and discussion or working papers that were written by either individuals or organisations with the view of guiding monitoring and evaluation activities, but not specific to the topic of this study. There were no formally documented studies on the topic and thus, this study intended to contribute and fill that gap. The target population for this study were respondents comprising of either project managers or project monitoring and evaluation officers randomly drawn from non-profit projects from International NGOs based in Nairobi. Simple random sampling method was employed for selecting respondents into a sample size of 73 non-profit projects drawn from the target population of 146 non-profit projects implemented by international NGOs in Nairobi. Data was collected using a closed structured questionnaire that was filled by either a project manager or project monitoring and evaluation officer randomly selected from each international organisation. The questionnaire was pretested for validity and reliability, and adjustments made before it was adopted for this study. Data gathered was then analysed using computer statistical software called SPSS and results presented using tables and charts based on the objectives and questions of the study. The study concluded that determinants of effective project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects include project enabling environment, stakeholders’ participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities, project capacity to supply project monitoring and evaluation information, and the project plan. The effectiveness of these determinants is manifested through easy assessment of projects, accountability in projects, capacity of staff to undertake project monitoring and evaluation work among others. The study recommended that human resources, finance resources, early planning for project monitoring and evaluation activities, information communication technology and involvement of all stakeholders in project monitoring and evaluation work as some of the considerations to be put in place for an effective project monitoring and evaluation system for a non-profit project. The study is beneficial to NGOs, development community and agencies for designing and implementing project monitoring and evaluation systems; and to scholars who may find the study valuable to add to the existing body of knowledge.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Determinant: This is a factor, circumstance, etc., that influences or determines.

Enabling Environment: This is a fundamental requirement to ensuring a commitment to not only launch an M&E exercise but to sustaining it over the long-term.

Evaluation: Evaluation is the periodic and systematic collection of data to assess the design, implementation and impact in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, distribution and sustainability of outcomes and impacts.

Monitoring: Monitoring is a continuous collection of data on specified indicators to facilitate decision making on whether an intervention (project, program or policy) is being implemented in line with the design i.e. its activity schedules and budget.

Monitoring and Evaluation System: Monitoring & Evaluation system is a process that is focused on continued tracking of project inputs, activities, and results in order to determine whether progress is being made towards pre-specified goals and objectives, and highlight whether there are any unintended (positive or negative) effects from a project and its activities. It is also an integral part of the project cycle and of good management practice.

Non Governmental Organisation: A non-governmental organization (NGO) is a legally constituted organization created by natural or legal persons that operate independently from any form of government and are not conventional for-profit business.

Project: An activity that has a beginning and an end which is carried out to achieve a particular purpose to a set quality, within a given time constraints and cost limits.

Project Director: This is a project staff responsible for accomplishing the stated project objectives. He is responsible for all aspects of the project including monitoring, evaluation and reporting.
Project infrastructure: This is what is needed to help ensure a systematic, comprehensive and credible approach to monitoring and evaluation of projects. It includes policies and standards that would clarify roles, responsibilities and accountabilities for performance monitoring and evaluation.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation officer: Refers to project staff responsible for guiding the overall M&E system and implementation of related activities within the project and via partners, plus providing timely and relevant information to project stakeholders.

Project Plan: Is a formal, approved document used to guide both project execution and project control. It is a statement of how and when a project's objectives are to be achieved, by showing the major products, milestones, activities and resources required on the project.

Technical capacity: Existence of credible and relevant data and information-gathering systems as well as the skilled personnel to gatheranalyse and report on the performance of the project.

Stakeholders: Refers to persons, groups or organizations with an interest in a non-profit project.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

A project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System is focused on tracking project inputs, activities, and results. It is often oriented towards donor reporting, however a good M&E system is more comprehensive than this, and is designed to facilitate learning while monitoring and evaluating the project achievements (World Bank, 2001).

Monitoring and evaluation systems are increasingly recognized as indispensable management functions that are at the heart of the principles and practices of management and contribute positively to decision-making. They are systems designed to inform project management whether implementation is going as planned and whether corrective action is needed to adjust implementation plans (Khan, 2000). This is in agreement with PASSIA, (2002) which describes it as a yardstick for the organization or project itself to see how it is doing against objectives.

The bilateral, multilateral and national organizations have in recent times reviewed how the practice of M&E can achieve greater consistency, comparability and aid effectiveness (World Bank, 2008). Thus, the practice and use of M&E as part of the decision-making process is more important than formal requirements for M&E because the real product of M&E is not reports or facts per se, but a higher quality of decision making (World Bank, 2001). Without effective M&E systems, it would be impossible to judge if work is going in the right direction, whether progress and success can be claimed, and how future efforts might be improved (UNDP, 2009).
The M&E systems can therefore help organizations extract relevant information from past and ongoing activities that can be used as the basis for programmatic fine-tuning, reorientation and future planning. Government officials, development managers and civil society are increasingly aware of the value of M&E systems of development activities (World Bank, 2001). This is because M&E provides a better means of learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders.

There is often confusion about what M&E systems entail. This is because many organizations see M&E systems as something that is a donor requirement rather than a management tool. PASSIA (2002) argues that M&E systems should be seen as something that helps a project or organization know when plans are not working, and when circumstances have changed; giving management the requisite information it needs to make decisions about the project, organisation or about changes that are necessary in strategy or plans.

Chaplowe, (2008) sums it all in the book ‘Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation planning’, stating that “M&E system provides the information needed to assess and guide the project strategy, ensure effective operations, meet internal and external reporting requirements, and inform future programming”. He further notes that there is not a single, recognized industry standard for assessing the quality of an M&E system.

Monitoring and evaluation can be conducted using a wide array of tools, methods and approaches. These include, for example: performance monitoring indicators; the logical framework; theory-based evaluation; formal surveys such as service delivery surveys, citizen report cards, living standards measurement surveys (LSMS) and core welfare indicators questionnaires (CWIQ); rapid appraisal methods such as key informant interviews, focus group discussions and facilitated brainstorming by staff and officials; participatory methods
such as participatory M&E; public expenditure tracking surveys; rigorous impact evaluation; and cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis. (Work Bank, 2001).

Although the term “monitoring and evaluation” tends to get run together as if it is only one thing, monitoring and evaluation are, in fact, two distinct sets of organisational activities, related but not identical (Shapiro, 2002). Shapiro describes monitoring as a process of continuously collecting information about the progress of the project to help organisations decide whether activities are being implemented as planned and information is then used to make decisions about improving the management and implementation of the programme. While evaluation is a process to measure the outcomes, impacts and effectiveness of a project, in order to use lessons learned. Project evaluations are separately scheduled activities performed at specific intervals. Thus, M&E are designed to provide answers to five key issues that include; relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (Welsh, 2005).

According to Welsh (2005), an effective M&E system is able to provide managers with information needed for day-to-day decisions, provide key stakeholders with information to guide the project strategy, provide early warnings of problems, help empower primary stakeholders, build understanding and capacity amongst those involved, and assess progress and so build accountability. As M&E consultant, Welsh believes that a good effective M&E system is a tool for managing for impact. He however cautions that an effective M&E system is not a tool that replaces the other specific management functions of planning, leading, organizing and controlling.

1.1.1 Non-Governmental Organisations in Kenya

A Non-Governmental organization (NGO) can either be national or international in nature. International NGOs have their head offices and activities controlled from their countries of
origin referred to as Home Office (HO). In Kenya, the early 90's saw the introduction of the NGO Coordination Act, which was aimed to bring the fast growing and largely unstructured civil society under government's control. This move forced NGOs to organize themselves into a group that could engage with government. The result was the promulgation of a law, the NGO Coordination Act, which provided a framework that was more conducive for NGOs. The law recognized the NGO Council, an umbrella organization for registered NGOs and the NGO Coordination Board (CB), which facilitated engagement between the sector and the government.

As a developing country, Kenya receives a large amount of foreign assistance, most of which is distributed through NGOs. Many of these NGOs have offices in Nairobi and operate at all levels. Many conduct high-impact; high-resource projects, and operates in the fields of health, refugees, environment, human rights, education, and key aspects of international development.

Currently, the activities of NGOs in Kenya are controlled by the NGO Co-ordination Board, which is a State Corporation established by an Act of Parliament, the Non-Governmental Organizations Co-ordination Act No. 19 of 1990. The Board's broad mandate is to register, regulate, coordinate, and facilitate all NGOs operating in Kenya. According to the Non-Governmental Organizations Co-ordination Board survey report of 2009, the international NGOs in Kenya comprise 18% of the total number of NGOs operating in the country.

The NGOs use a number of approaches in addressing their objectives and these are categorised into three broad areas of advocacy, service provision and capacity building although a number of NGOs employ more than one strategy. The study will focus on international NGOs with offices located in Nairobi for easy access.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Although M&E is an integral tool in managing and assessing the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of projects, there has been an increased need for development community, governments and agencies to respond to calls for projects to be successful with evidence of proper M&E systems, (IFAD, 2002).

There is a growing need for development organisations to assessment aid effectiveness and to measure the results of development interventions based on their intended objectives. UNDP (2009) for example stipulates that it is no longer acceptable for governments, official development agencies, and nongovernmental organizations to simply report how much money has been invested or what outputs have been produced. This was demonstrated in an International Conference on Financing for Development hosted by development partners in Monterrey in 2002, where they agreed to focus on managing for development results, an approach that advocates for a stronger orientation of M&E systems towards development results (World Bank, 2008).

This increased focus of donors and borrowers on impact has resulted in a high demand for expertise in M&E systems; with NGOs required to submit M&E results frameworks and performance management/monitoring plans (PMP) as prerequisite to funding. Moreover, developing and using these M&E systems is not an easy task for project or program personnel because the concept is relatively new and personnel may lack substantial background knowledge in the subject.

Another point to note is the unavailability of formally documented studies on the topic; determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. Available literature relates to manuals, guidelines, policies and discussion papers written by individuals or organisations like World Bank on the topic. Although a relatively small
number of NGOs, mainly INGOs have shown interest in elaborating these factors, many NGOs with decades of experience in project M&E have made little progress to bring them out clearly (UNDP, 2009). Thus, the study examined these factors (determinants) and in particular explored how the project plan, project technical capacity, environment and stakeholder’s participation influence the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects with the aim of contributing and to fill the gap.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study was to establish the key determinants of an effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects. The study was designed to meet four specific objectives:

i. To establish how the project plan influences the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

ii. To determine the influence of project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

iii. To explore the extent stakeholders’ participation influences the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

iv. To explain how enabling environment influences the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were used as a guide in the achievement of the objectives of the study:

i. How does the project plan influence the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects?
ii. What role does project technical capacity to supply M&E information play in enhancing effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects?

iii. How does stakeholders' participation contribute in the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects?

iv. How does the enabling environment affect the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study is beneficial to NGOs, development community and agencies involved in the execution of non-profit projects. In particular, this study provides information to staff and individuals involved in project management like project managers and consultants in designing and implementing effective M&E systems; thus enhancing and strengthening project M&E systems.

The study is also beneficial to other scholars who may find the study valuable to add to the existing body of knowledge. The study is an empirical source for future research and in particular a source of reference material for future researchers and academia on related topic.

The findings are also useful to the government as a guide or reference material when developing policies in the area of monitoring and evaluation.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study covered International NGOs based in Nairobi, with monitoring and evaluation personnel/staff of these NGOs forming the target population for the study. The target population was composed of people who have in-depth understanding of planning, designing and execution of M&E systems. The choice of the target population enabled the researcher to gather information that was more reliable and of acceptable accuracy. However, the study
focused on only determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

This study was not without limitations. Although a lot has been written about monitoring and evaluation in project management, scarcity of literature relating to the topic was one of the challenges that were encountered during the study. However, the researcher used the wise counsel of the university staff and supervisors in locating literature relevant for the study.

Respondents' cooperation was also an issue during the study. Some respondents were uncooperative due to different reasons including busy schedules and sensitivity of some information. To mitigate this limitation, the researcher obtained all the necessary permission from the relevant authorities and booked appointments appropriately.

The scope of the study was not extensive enough to capture the views of various stakeholders involved in monitoring and evaluation because it's targeted only international NGOs based in Nairobi. Thus, the study findings may not be fully representative.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature of the study with a view of simplifying and clarifying the research problem, research variables and identify knowledge gaps. The chapter focuses on a theoretical review of M&E frameworks, tools and approaches. This is followed by a review of empirical data on determinants of M&E systems and how they influence the effectiveness of non-profit projects. A conceptual framework to show the relationship between these variables is provided at the end of this chapter.

2.2 Theoretical Review

2.2.1 Logical Framework

The logical framework or Log frame is an analytical tool used to plan, monitor, and evaluate projects (PASSIA, 2002). The Log frame is a way of structuring the main elements in a project and highlighting the logical linkages between them. The log Frame provides a structure for logical thinking in project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. It makes the project logic clear and links project objectives, strategies, inputs, and activities to the specified needs. It also indicates the means by which project achievement may be measured (UNDP, 2009). It derives its name from the logical linkages set out by the planner(s) to connect a project’s means with its ends. Compared to most other project management tools, the Log frame has the potential to organize a considerable amount of information in a coherent and concise manner.
The Log frame has a distinct advantage of focusing project planners, and subsequently, its implementers and evaluators (Coleman 1987; Sartorius 1996). The columns of the Log frame matrix represent the levels of project objectives and the means to achieve them. Each lower level of activity must contribute to the achievement of a higher level and is called the vertical logic. The rows indicate how the achievement of objectives can be measured and verified. This is called the horizontal logic. The horizontal logic of the matrix helps establish the basis for monitoring and evaluating the project by asking how outputs, objectives, purpose and goal can be measured, and what the suitable indicators are.

Thus, a Log frame is simply a matrix which summarizes what the project intends to do and how, what kind of effects are expected, what the project key assumptions are, and how outputs and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated as shown in the table below.
Table 2.2.1 Logical Frame Matrix Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Methods of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> The broader development impact to which the project/program contributes at a national and/or sectorial level.</td>
<td>Measures of the extent to which a contribution to the goal has been made. Used during evaluation.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> The development Outcome expected at the end of the project. All components will contribute to this.</td>
<td>Conditions at the end of the project indicating that the Purpose has been achieved. Used for project completion and evaluation.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the purpose/goal linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Objectives:</strong> The expected outcome of producing each component’s outputs.</td>
<td>Measures of the extent to which component objectives have been achieved. Used during review and evaluation.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the component objective/purpose linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs:</strong> The direct measurable results (goods and services) of the project which are largely under project management’s control.</td>
<td>Measures of the quantity and quality of outputs and the timing of their delivery. Used during monitoring and review.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the output/component objective linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong> The tasks carried out to implement the project and deliver the identified outputs.</td>
<td>Implementation/work program targets. Used during monitoring.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Shapiro, 2002)

### 2.2.3 Theory based Evaluation

The World Bank (2004) monitoring and evaluation handbook states that theory-based evaluation has similarities to the Log frame approach but allows a much more in-depth understanding of the workings of a program or activity—the “program theory” or “program logic.” In particular, it need not assume simple linear cause-and-effect relationships. By mapping out the determining or causal factors judged important for success, and how they might interact, it can then be decided which steps should be monitored as the program
develops, to see how well they are in fact borne out. This allows the critical success factors to be identified. And where the data show these factors have not been achieved, a reasonable conclusion is that the program is less likely to be successful in achieving its objectives.

Theory based evaluation can be used for mapping design of complex activities and improving planning and management. This is because it provides early feedback about what is or is not working, and why; allows early correction of problems as soon as they emerge; assists in identification of unintended side-effects of the program/project and helps in prioritizing which issues to investigate in greater depth, perhaps using more focused data collection or more sophisticated M&E techniques. UNDP (2009) handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation argues that it can easily become overly complex if the scale of activities is large or if an exhaustive list of factors and assumptions is assembled and stakeholders might disagree about which determining factors they judge important, which can be time-consuming to address.

2.2.4 Formal Surveys

Formal surveys can be used to collect standardized information from a carefully selected sample of people or households (World Bank, 2004). Surveys often collect comparable information for a relatively large number of people in particular target groups. We use them for providing baseline data against which the performance of the strategy, program, or project can be compared; comparing different groups at a given point in time; comparing changes over time in the same group; comparing actual conditions with the targets established in a program or project design; describing conditions in a particular community or group, and providing a key input to a formal evaluation of the impact of a program or project or assessing levels of poverty.
The advantages of formal surveys include; findings from the sample of people interviewed can be applied to the wider target group or the population as a whole and quantitative estimate can be made for the size and distribution of impacts (PREVAL, 2005). PREVAL deliberates that, with the exception of CWIQ, results are often not available for a long period of time; the processing and analysis of data can be a major bottleneck for the larger surveys even where computers are available. This therefore means that they require sound technical and analytical skills for sample and questionnaire design, data analysis, and processing (World Bank, 2004). Formal surveys can be Multi-Topic Household Survey (also known as Living Standards Measurement Survey—LSMS), Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire (CWIQ), Client Satisfaction (or Service Delivery) Survey and Citizen Report Cards.

2.2.5 Rapid Appraisal Methods

Rapid appraisal methods are quick, low-cost ways to gather the views and feedback of beneficiaries and other stakeholders, in order to respond to decision-makers’ needs for information (World Bank (2004). This is also illustrated in Method23 (2003) monitoring and evaluation handbook for empowering managers. Rapid appraisals are good at providing rapid information for management decision-making, especially at the project or program level; providing qualitative understanding of complex socioeconomic changes, highly interactive social situations, or people’s values, motivations, and reactions, and providing context and interpretation for quantitative data collected by more formal methods. They also have advantage low cost, can be conducted quickly and provide flexibility to explore new ideas. However, rapid appraisal methods are disadvantageous in that findings usually relate to specific communities or localities—thus difficult to generalize from findings and most of the time they are less valid, reliable, and credible than formal surveys. Rapid appraisal methods include; key informant interview, focus group discussion, community group interview, direct observation and mini-survey.
2.2.6 Participatory Methods

Participatory methods provide active involvement in decision-making for those with a stake in a project, program, or strategy and generate a sense of ownership in the M&E results and recommendations (Shapiro, 2002). UNICEF (1991) guide for monitoring and evaluation also further explains that participatory methods help in learning about local conditions and local people's perspectives and priorities to design more responsive and sustainable interventions; they are useful in identifying problems and trouble-shooting problems during implementation and in evaluating a project, program, or policy. The advantages of participatory methods include usefulness in examining relevant issues by involving key players in the design process, establishing partnerships and local ownership of projects, enhances local learning, management capacity, and skills, and provides timely, reliable information for management decision-making. World Bank (2004) highlights disadvantages of participatory methods as sometimes regarded as fewer objectives, time-consuming if key stakeholders are involved in a meaningful way and a potential for domination and misuse by some stakeholders to further their own interests. It further states commonly used participatory methods that include: stakeholder analysis, participatory rural appraisal, beneficiary assessment and participatory monitoring and evaluation.

2.2.7 Public expenditure tracking surveys

Public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS) track the flow of public funds and determine the extent to which resources actually reach the target groups (World Bank, 2004). The surveys examine the manner, quantity, and timing of releases of resources to different levels of government, particularly to the units responsible for the delivery of social services such as health and education. PETS are often implemented as part of larger service delivery and facility surveys which focus on the quality of service, characteristics of the facilities, their management, incentive structures, etc. UNICEF (1991) adds that PETS can be used for
diagnosing problems in service delivery quantitatively, providing evidence on delays, “leakage,” and corruption. However, PETS support the pursuit of accountability when little financial information is available and improves management by pinpointing bureaucratic bottlenecks in the flow of funds for service delivery. Nonetheless, UNDP (2009) handbook states that the only problem is that government agencies may be reluctant to open their accounting books and the cost of implementing such is substantial.

2.2.8 Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis

According to IFAD (2002), cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis are tools for assessing whether or not the costs of an activity can be justified by the outcomes and impacts. Cost-benefit analysis measures both inputs and outputs in monetary terms. Cost-effectiveness analysis estimates inputs in monetary terms and outcomes in non-monetary quantitative terms (such as improvements in student reading scores). Mcdonald (2002) shares the same view when he said that cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis can be used for informing decisions about the most efficient allocation of resources and identifying projects that offer the highest rate of return on investment. Thus, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness are useful in good quality approach for estimating the efficiency of programs and projects, it makes explicit the economic assumptions that might otherwise remain implicit or overlooked at the design stage and it’s useful for convincing policy-makers and funders that the benefits justify the activity.

Nevertheless, World Bank (2004) argue that disadvantages in Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis are such that they are fairly technical, requiring adequate financial and human resources available, the requisite data for cost-benefit calculations may not be available, and projected results may be highly dependent on assumptions made; and results must be interpreted with care, particularly in projects where benefits are difficult to quantify.
Impact evaluation is the systematic identification of the effects — positive or negative, intended or not — on individual households, institutions, and the environment caused by a given development activity such as a program or project (PASSIA, 2002). It further states that impact evaluation helps us better understand the extent to which activities reach the poor and the magnitude of their effects on people’s welfare. Impact evaluations can range from large scale sample surveys in which project populations and control groups are compared before and after, and possibly at several points during program intervention; to small-scale rapid assessment and participatory appraisals where estimates of impact are obtained from combining group interviews, key informants, case studies and available secondary data (World Bank, 2004).

Shapiro (2002) has it that impact evaluations can be used for measuring outcomes and impacts of an activity and distinguishing these from the influence of other external factors; they can also be used in helping to clarify whether costs for an activity are justified, in informing decisions on whether to expand, modify or eliminate projects, programs or policies. Shapiro argues that impact evaluations can also be used in drawing lessons for improving the design and management of future activities, comparing the effectiveness of alternative interventions and strengthening accountability for results.

According to World Bank (2004), advantages of using impact evaluations are such that they provide estimates of the magnitude of outcomes and impacts for different demographic groups, regions or over time, and systematic analysis and rigor can give managers and policymakers added confidence in decision-making. The disadvantages include that some approaches are very expensive and time-consuming, although faster and more economical approaches are also used; reduced utility when decision-makers need information quickly and difficulties in identifying an appropriate counter-factual. Examples of impact evaluation...
designs include; randomized pre-test post-test evaluation, quasi-experimental design with before and after comparisons of project and control populations, ex-post comparison of project and non-equivalent control group and rapid assessment ex-post impact evaluations.

World Bank handbook further concludes that the above M&E tools, methods and approaches are complementary; and some are substitutes. Some have broad applicability, while others are quite narrow in their uses. The choice of which is appropriate for any given context will depend on a range of considerations. These include the uses for which M&E is intended, the main stakeholders who have an interest in the M&E findings, the speed with which the information is needed, and the cost.

2.3 Empirical Review

2.3.1 Proper Planning

If you do not care about how well you are doing or about what impact you are having, why bother to do it at all? Monitoring and evaluation enable you to assess the quality and impact of your work, against your action plans and your strategic plan, (Shapiro, 2002). In order for monitoring and evaluation to be valuable, you do need to have planned well. In the project plan, a vision highlights a vision has an essential building block for effective development, implementation and sustainability of M&E system in the public sector (Lahey, 2005). He attributes vision to an understanding of how M&E information can assist public sector managers and decision makers; requiring strategic leadership as well as a clear understanding of the basic concepts and potential uses of M&E information, built around a visual 'outcomes model' of the project, program, or organization plan.

Monitoring and evaluation enables NGOs to make assessments from the start since they have a plan that guides them from one achievement to the next. Project plans give management the information it needs to make decisions about the project or organization, about changes that
are necessary in strategy or plans. Through this, the constants (project plans) remain the pillars of the strategic framework: the problem analysis, the vision, and the values of the project or organization. Everything else is negotiable. Thus, monitoring and evaluation should be part a planning process. For instance, it is very difficult to go back and set up monitoring and evaluation systems once things have begun to happen. NGOs need to begin gathering information about performance and in relation to targets from the word go. In fact, the first information gathering should take place when you do your needs assessment. This will give you the information you need against which to assess improvements over time. When you do your planning process, you will set indicators.

A proper plan also gives the organization an estimate of resources to be used. Without accounting for the available resources that the organization may use, the project will not even take the first step. Planning is thus, an essential part of monitoring and evaluation by which other issues will be fixed and NGOs are determined to incorporate this fundamental step in their projects in order to attain all their objectives. A clear project plan also forms the foundation of the project. Shapiro (2000) adds that one should not forget to plan for a baseline study. All projects should have some form of measurement of the initial status of appropriate indicators prior to implementation for later comparison to help assess trends and impact. Paul Hutchinson and Anne LaFond (2004) developed a system for analysis and proposed that once indicators have been identified, the next step is to establish the baseline. The baseline allows for measurement of changes in the indicators over the life of the project. It also establishes the data sources and collection methods that will be used in monitoring the project. For non-profit projects, the baseline often provides an evaluation of the existing adaptive capacity of target groups, allowing project teams to monitor changes in adaptive capacity over the life of the project. Ideally, the analysis stage has provided a basis for this
concept. However, it is likely that further assessment will be needed in order to have a complete picture of the baseline adaptive.

Planning of the baseline factor (and subsequent monitoring) is critical to maximize efficiency and effectiveness, and to minimize the burden on project teams and stakeholders. It is important that the baseline gather only data that is needed and will be analysed and used by the project team and stakeholders. For example when a NGO is implementing projects in communities where other NGOs already have a presence, the first step should be to evaluate what data and information is already available from other projects, how this information can be used within the baseline of the non-profit projects, and what are the gaps. This will allow the design of a baseline that focuses on the specific issues of importance to the NGOs project, and avoids project stakeholders having to provide the same information repeatedly.

Conceptual and operational clarity of the project plan, and quality change objectives expressed in chains of change and logical models, including a Log frame, particularly with regard to the development of outcome and impact indicators, as well as a clearly defined project strategy go a long way in making M&E systems that are simple, progressive development oriented process, and one that is user-friendly and guarantees development of simple, flexible, innovative, suitable tools and instruments needed in the collection of information (PREVAL, 2005).

Plans are essential, but they are not set in concrete (totally fixed) within the baseline resulting to their poor attainment of goals and objectives. If they are not working, or if the circumstances change, then plans need to change too. Monitoring and evaluation are both tools, which help a project or organization know when plans are not working, and when circumstances have changed (Khan, 2000). They give management the information it needs to make decisions about the project or organization, about changes that are necessary in
strategy or plans. Through this, the constants remain the pillars of the strategic framework: the problem analysis, the vision, and the values of the project or organization. Everything else is negotiable. Getting something wrong is not a crime.

Nevertheless, failing to learn from past mistakes because you are not monitoring and evaluating, poses the greatest challenge of designing and implementing the M&E systems. The effect of monitoring and evaluation is usually observable at during the project development cycle. Unrau et al., (2001) pertaining this, argued that it is essential to note that you will monitor and adjust several times before you are ready to evaluate and re-plan. Non-profit organizations have to understand; therefore, that poor planning is a clear indication that the organization will fail and the utilized resources will be waste since there will be no any form of utility on such project. Managers and projects coordinators have to ensure appropriate plan for the operation and set targets to be achieved at every step (Jody & Ray, 2004).

2.3.2 Project Technical Capacity to Supply M&E Information

In recent years, efforts to strengthen national M&E systems have yielded significant progress and improved harmonization of M&E activities. However, certain weaknesses in both monitoring and evaluation have persisted. In terms of monitoring, data that are routinely collected are often not analysed to inform program management, especially at local program management levels. With reference to evaluations, very few programs consistently plan or conduct evaluative activities.

In addition, the M&E agenda is often affected by donor influences and therefore not always fully aligned with national priorities. Strengthening country M&E systems is a priority of the Global Fund, with the credibility and effectiveness of the performance-based funding model dependent upon the availability of high-quality data. Few doubt the importance of technical
capacity and infrastructure in the modern era, and few would deny that effective monitoring and evaluation is needed to support this work. Nevertheless, the monitoring and evaluation of technical capacity is as much a challenge now as it was two decades ago to the implementation of a sound M&E system (OECD, 2006). The infrastructure would also include the organizational units that would serve to conduct or manage M&E exercises; as well as the Policy Centre that provides the policy direction, oversight and assistance, needed particularly for new emerging M&E systems.

Technical capacity includes both the existence of credible and relevant data and information-gathering systems as well as the skilled personnel to gather, analyse, and report on the performance of government policies and programs. Additionally, infrastructure is needed to help ensure a systematic, comprehensive, and credible approach to M&E. This would include policies and standards that would clarify roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities for performance monitoring and evaluation; establish expectations across the system timing and level of reporting; and, set out quality standards for M&E conduct. The infrastructure would also include the organizational units that would serve to conduct or manage M&E exercises; as well, the Policy Centre that provides the policy direction, oversight and assistance, needed particularly for new emerging M&E systems (OECD, 2006).

The main findings of the research are that where organizations are clear about what they want to achieve through improved capacity (or technical capacity). Then where there is a clear understanding of the purpose of M&E, it is not difficult to come up with a sensible blend of tools, methodologies, and approaches that can meet the needs of different stakeholders. But if technical capacity providers lack an adequate theory of change; if they do not know what results they want to achieve; or if M&E work is burdened by uncertain, conflicting, or unrealistic demands, then the whole area can appear to be a minefield.
Organisations believe that capacity development is an internal process that involves the main actor(s) taking primary responsibility for change processes. It is a complex human process based on values, emotions, and beliefs. It involves changes in relationships between different actors and involves shifts in power and identity; and it is both uncertain and to a degree, unpredictable (James and Hailey 2007). If technical capacity development is understood as an internal process, capacity building is more often understood as a purposeful, external intervention to strengthen capacity over time. However, despite its on-going commitment to technical capacity and infrastructure, the development community is not clear what is meant by the concept and different organizations have different interpretations.

The focus of M&E is therefore not only capacity development (changes in capacity at individual, organization, or societal level) but also the extent to which this is supported (or hindered) by external interventions. There is also a range of different technical capacity and infrastructure recipients. This includes individuals, organizations, and sector, thematic, geographic, or issue-based networks and coalitions. Increasingly, institutional donors are also supporting technical capacity building at government and civil society levels, not only to improve performance directly, but also to increase accountability and mutual engagement in policy making under a governance agenda (OECD, 2006). NGOs as well as civil society can improve on their governance and management operations in various ways. These include stating their mission, values and objectives clearly and ensuring that these strategies are followed. Better human resources development and training for their managers and staff including board members and volunteers. Better management processes as well as financial management, accounting, and budget systems.

Nevertheless, in order for these systems to be implemented, committed staff and leadership within the NGOs themselves are required. The expanded role of NGOs in the delivery of
public services is likely to affect the potential of these organizations. The work of NGOs is much more difficult and demanding now as they are expected to deliver quality with such limited resources. Problems arise where governments shift major responsibilities to the NGO sector. According to Schiavo-Campo (2001), some NGOs do not have the time and expertise to manage all of the funded programs, or even to ensure full involvement by all of the communities, as is normally claimed. In some cases, where there are many departments trying to deal with the NGOs, the problems may be created by the governments themselves.

According to Kenyan reports, there is an urgent need for the NGO sector to develop and invest in its human resource capacity (Skinner et al., 2003; Taylor, and Dryfoos, 1998). This need appears to be exacerbated by the increasingly complex needs of clients in community NGOs and different organizations. From a survey across the country as pertains to community service conducted by the Kenyan Council Of Social Service (KCOSS) in 2010, 69% of respondents reported that their clients in 2009-10 had more complex needs than in 2008-09. In view of this trend, agencies reported that their most pressing training need was how to work with clients that have difficult and complex problems.

Skinner et al noted that workshop development is required not just for frontline staff, but also for management, who need to be effective in such areas as leadership, networking, understanding the context in which the organization operates, and managing staff performance. There is also a need for activities and mechanisms to ensure board members function with maximum effectiveness (Fishel, 2003).

Organizational change is an integral part of workforce development. Organizational change can be stressful for all involved and must be managed carefully to be effective. Strategies such as involving employees and other stakeholders in decision-making processes, encouraging staff commitment to change, and building in reward systems for change can
facilitate what can otherwise be a stressful process (Skinner et al., 2003). Skinner et al emphasized that workforce development is not simply staff training. It requires a multi-faceted approach to improve the effectiveness of the workforce and thus, the responsibilities of the human resources department.

The other critical issue for HR capacity development is workforce sustainability. Skinner et al (2003: 23) described a sustainable workforce as one in which the number and skills of the workforce matches the needs of the client population, individuals are positively engaged with their work and have the capacity to perform at their highest potential. It also refers to a situation where individuals' work contributes to their well-being as well as opportunities are provided for individuals to further their professional development and career prospects (career paths). Building sustainability requires multiple strategies to enhance the organizations capacity to recruit and retain staff, maintain high motivation, alleviate stress, prevent burnout, enhance job satisfaction, and to reduce staff turnover. All these aspects provide so many challenges to the NGOs and civil society organization. In addition, staff at the local level may not be familiar with government policies and this affects efficiency of the NGOs because of tensions, which may arise (Lekorwe & Mpabanga, 2007)

One of the most intractable challenges that NGOS in Kenya face is that of finding analysis experts in M&E work be they national or international, which have skills in mentoring and facilitation. While consultants who can produce technical “deliverables” are required, there is also a need for those development practitioners and consultants with skills in the areas of M&E for coaching, leadership development, management development, and change management training. This is an area of capacity development expertise, and can be teamed with the needed sector or theme-specific technical expertise.
In Timor Leste, (2008) study, capacity development in the civil service is actively building in a system of measuring performance of both technical experts and counterparts that goes beyond the assessment of hard deliverables and focuses on skills of mentorship, transference of capacity and facilitation of change. On the other hand, change management exercises are highly unpredictable in terms of what they achieve. Experts agree that most change projects fail. Pascale (1999) suggests this is the case for 80% of change programs. Management experts' opinions converge on several causes that can derail change efforts. Nevertheless, what we do know is that change management shifts roles and capacities of different actors, which in turn shifts the existing bases of power. Building in risk assessments and accounting for such initial instability, while managing its boundaries through managing people's expectations and concerns, is a necessary part of organizational change strategy to deliver functional monitoring and evaluation tools (Khan, 2000).

2.3.3 Stakeholders' Participation in Project monitoring and evaluation activities

Planning an M&E system based on stakeholder needs and expectations helps to ensure understanding, ownership, and use of M&E information (PASSIA, 2002). It is essential to have a clear understanding of the priorities and information needs of people interested in or affected by the project or programme. This includes stakeholder motivations, experience and commitment, as well as the political and other constraints under which various stakeholders operate. It is especially important that local knowledge be sought when planning M&E functions to ensure that they are relevant to and feasible in the local context, and that M&E information is credible, accepted, and more likely to be supported.

Typically, a stakeholder assessment is conducted during the planning stage of a project or programme. This initial assessment can inform M&E planning, but for planning the M&E system, it is recommended to focus more specifically on the informational needs and
expectations of the key stakeholders. Sometimes there is a combination of M&E requirements from multiple donors and partners. It is best early in the project/programme design stage to coordinate these expectations and requirements as much as possible to reduce the burden on project/programme implementation. Agreement on common indicators, methods, tools, and formats not only reduces the M&E overload, but it can conserve human and financial resources.

Stakeholders are the main reason why an organization is operating within a given region. They thus, are major determinants of what input should be put in an organization and who should lead the day-to-day management of the organization. Over the past several years, issues of “participation” have become increasingly important. Like other international development institutions, NGOs have recognized that participation is essential to the achievement of its overarching objectives of poverty reduction and sustainable development. Participatory approaches have been shown to enhance project quality, ownership, and sustainability; to empower targeted beneficiaries (in particular, women and poor people) and to contribute to long-term capacity building and self-sufficiency.

Numerous organisations refer to the importance of “stakeholder participation” and encourage staff to utilize a “participatory approach” in their day-to-day operations. For example, the company vision statement emphasizes the importance of “a bottom-up, participatory approach” and a client-responsive approach to ensure stakeholder commitment and ownership. The firm’s document entitled “operationalising the vision” calls for a shift to an approach where all stakeholders, including targeted beneficiaries of civil society, the donor community, and borrower countries are involved from the outset of program design through to implementation. It is therefore, clear that all company stakeholders need to be engaged in
one way or the other since the company was developed in order to satisfy their wishes and general country objective on eradicating poverty.

Effective analysis of stakeholders in a structured and systematic manner fosters participation by project stakeholders in data collection and assessment. Participatory systems must in particular ensure that they are sensitive to the needs and priorities of all including women and marginalized groups, creating a "safe" space for all stakeholders to provide their perspectives. Taylor and Sipe (2005) liken that it is important that the monitoring system incorporates clear and specific strategies for tracking results, and that it examines both intended and unintended impacts of project activities. As previously mentioned, monitoring of non-profit projects may involve monitoring processes as well as results, requiring different approaches and data collection methods. Within the context of non-profit projects, it is important to monitor changes to the context, particularly the climate context, and to adjust the project approach and strategies accordingly. Nevertheless, institutional or organizational change is hard to conceptualize for public sector organizations and harder to apply. Codification of empirical knowledge to guide the operational manager becomes a huge boon to this process. Organizational leaders tasked with managing change are engaged in a great venture of exploration, risk, discovery, and change, without any comprehensive maps for guidance (Senge, 1999). A mapping of change management process steps, which will bring out the desired goals for M&E, and ensuring it is consulted on, widely disseminated and agreed to, is key to its relevance and effectiveness.

2.3.4 Enabling Environment

A fundamental requirement to ensuring a commitment to launch not only an M&E exercise, but to sustaining it over the long-term should be put in place. This translates into a commitment to resource such an exercise as well as providing an enabling environment to
allow it to develop and mature (Kusek and Ray, 2004). Given that the introduction of an M&E system might challenge the current culture and the way of doing things within government organizations, political will and leadership are essential to support the values and ethics that underlie a successful M&E system; that is, transparency, objectivity, accountability and a commitment to a 'results'-orientation and good governance.

Organizational cultures and enabling environment range from being exploitative authoritarian to consultative participatory. The monitoring and evaluation literature has a number of examples where organizational climate has influenced the incorporation of M&E results into daily practice and decision-making. A consultative-participatory approach to management comes close to the ideal environment for the development of an effective evaluation practice. In this environment, information is used to guide decisions and actions rather than punish subordinates.

The introduction of M&E system in a public institution or on a countrywide basis is a significant undertaking that generally requires both organizational human resources changes as well as cultural changes within the public sector. For example, establishing clarity of purpose for the M&E system, and communicating the vision are important elements at the outset. To be effective, M&E needs to be positioned as far more than a technical instrument for change. It is not enough to simply create a highly trained evaluation capacity and expect that organizations and systems will eventually become more effective. This is particularly true in situations where a broad-based and systematic approach to M&E had not previously existed, as in the case of many developing countries. There is a need to address also the institutional capacity and indeed the drivers that are generating the demand for Evaluation.

Political support is needed as an essential 'driver' to launch and resource the M&E exercise. This will lead the change in organizational culture that may be needed to provide the
champion(s), ensure an enabling environment, deflect resistance to the introduction of M&E and the changes that this might imply, and to provide the basis to help ensure that the M&E system is sustainable over the long term. The experience of other countries has shown that such support for M&E often comes because of broad-based public sector reform initiatives that may incorporate M&E as useful tools for purposes of monitoring, reporting, and accountability. The successful development and implementation of an M&E system takes more than political will though. Even with a resource commitment to invest in M&E development, the technical hurdles may require a lengthy process to put in place and develop credible data systems; train needed M&E specialists; and educate managers throughout the system on how and where M&E information will be used. This is generally a lengthy and iterative process, as the experience of most countries using M&E systems would attest to; and, one where allowance for continuous learning and improvement through oversight mechanisms is particularly beneficial to the improvement of the M&E system.

An organization with an expressed policy to undertake and support internal evaluation provides visible proof of the commitment of the board of directors and senior management to monitoring and evaluation. A clearly stated policy regarding evaluation legitimizes the activity and encourages positive expectations and attitudes among the staff. The achievement of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in Kenya or any other National Development Strategy objectives requires a highly performing public sector with sound policies in place to support the strategies. A public sector that is able to deliver public goods and services, and to play its role as a facilitator of economic development by supporting public and private initiatives and ensuring a conducive social and economic environment. Internal and external forces are reinforcing the push for the public sector to perform more effectively, exhibit better management practices and focus on and to deliver results with emphasis on the centrality of the citizen or customer and accountability for results. Efficiency must be
improved in all areas of public expenditure. This is so that better value for money in terms of the quality and quantity of services can be achieved with the scarce resources available to Government.

The Government, therefore, may respond to this challenge by creating policies, which protect the functions and roles of the civil societies operating within the country. This will facilitate better coordination of the machinery of Government to achieve the development outcomes effectively. Policies protecting members is also essential because the concern stakeholders will come from various regions and without such protections most will not work for long. Policies are also meant to coordinate use of resource and relate to the core objectives of the project so that it can be completed on time. In addition, activities that run with no policy governing its scope cannot attract adequate investors because it seems to be based on poor management and may collapse anytime (Uphoff, 1991).

According to Unrau et al (2001), ideal M&E systems are internally driven by policies which encourage continuous and routine use of evaluation methods by practitioners for their own and their client’s benefit without being requested by outside sources. They should also be integrated into daily practice. Evaluation systems are an accepted part of daily tasks. Changes to these tasks are instigated by line-level staffs, which are given the opportunity to identify problems and suggest solutions based on program data. In addition, monitoring systems fed back to staff. It is necessary to review constantly the instruments used in monitoring systems and to talk to staff about questions that may arise. This allows staff to see what happens with the information they collect and includes them in decisions that come from that information.

Proper logistical mechanism forms part of the enabling environment. Design and implementation of M&E systems require proper mechanisms and logistics for effective and successful completion of objectives (Jody & Ray, 2004). To ensure the relevance of
advancement, evaluative evidence should demonstrate “real time” capability. An immediate advantage is that conclusions can be field-checked with respondents within weeks, providing important opportunities for eliminating erroneous interpretations, increasing respondents’ sense of ownership of their distilled experiences and providing evaluative results to interested stakeholders when it is likely to be most useful. Giving real-time results to stakeholder means getting it right from the start. The publication of outdated results or irrelevant recommendations should decrease once dissemination of real-time information becomes normal practice from the M&E systems.

Political willpower is a condition or requirement for being able to set up an impact and learning oriented M&E system, that is to say, a participatory M&E system (PREVAL, 2005). There is no doubt that with increasing demands on the state by the citizens, the state can no longer be the sole provider of goods and services. It is also true that the support and interest in NGOs has grown because of the failure by state agencies to deliver services. Thus, the state and NGOs need each other. In terms of their relation with the state, Clark (1991) provides a liberalist view in terms of three options; they can complement, reform, and/or oppose the state. However, with these close associations, the Kenyan government has faced a lot of political interference as regards the functions of the NGOs and civil society organizations. In their role of complementing the state, they act as the implementers of development activities. In this case as argued by Thomas, (1992) NGOs fill the gaps left by the public service.

The role of the state becomes more of an enabler rather than a provider of services. In their reforming role, NGOs are seen as agents of advocacy and contribute immensely to policy dialogue. NGOs are able to represent the interests of the people they work with and in this case can ensure that policies are adaptable to real life situations. Finally, NGOs can oppose the state. They can do this by acting as watchdogs and holding the state accountable. This can
be achieved through several methods including lobbying or even overtly supporting groups, which are adversely affected by the policies of the government (Thomas, 1992). Hence, from the foregoing, it is clear that NGO-government relationships are complex and diverse and are likely to affect the management of NGO activities. The relationships are affected by the specific contextual factors, which may include the nature of NGOs objectives and strategies, the area of operation of an NGO, the behaviour of the donor and the nature and character of the regime (Turner & Hulme, 1997). These relations also differ from country to country. In some countries, certain regimes are favourable to NGOs while in others the relations are antagonistic.

Because the government controls the operations of these NGOs and the scope of the civil society, some areas of interest to the NGOs may not be reached because the politicians with their selfish interests can divert the resources to other sectors, claiming that it is of urgency while according to the NGOs it is not. The NGOs under such situation have no powers of doing the opposite, and eventually their objectives of empowering the less fortunate and preserving the environment is not achieved. In some cases, where the government is stranded they call for assistances and integration of activities in order to attain some given goals. In addition, some instances where the government has a positive social agenda, which resonates with the NGOs, there is potential for a strong, collaborative relationship. However, even where there is room for cooperation, jealousies, and mistrust between NGOs and governments are deep rooted. Governments always have the fear that NGOs will erode their political power and NGOs on the other hand, mistrust the motivations of government officials (Fowler, 1992).

Thus, political support is needed as an essential ‘driver’ to launch and resource the M&E exercise; lead the change in organizational culture that may be needed; provide the champion(s); ensure an enabling environment; deflect resistance to the introduction of M&E
and the changes that this might imply; and, provide the basis to help ensure that the M&E system is sustainable over the long term. He further says that successful development and implementation of an M&E system takes more than political will; even with a resource commitment to invest in M&E development, the technical hurdles may require a lengthy process to put in place and develop credible data systems; train needed M&E specialists; and educate managers throughout the system on how and where M&E information will be used (Lahey, 2005).

The key to the design and implementation of the NGOs and civil societies’ plans is to ensure proper technological advancement. This way, M&E plans can be effectively delivered, but currently, there are no adequate resources or skilled personnel deliver that strategy; hence, the implementation of NGOs M&E systems have been slowed down (Muzinda, 2010). INGOs strongly depend on the local personnel to carry out their functions, but the local population have no sufficient experiences in this field of IT hence, their programs are costly and takes more time to be executed because the organization have to hire personnel from other areas leading to increased cost of operation (Jody & Ray, 2004).

As noted earlier in this paper, one of the major factors influencing the effective designing management, sustainability, and implementing of monitoring and evaluation systems of NGOs is the nature of their dependability on donor funding. A majority of NGOs in developed and developing countries were established in order to complement and supplement governments’ developmental and service delivery efforts. Multilateral organizations such as the United Nations, World Bank, Commonwealth Secretariat, as well as regional organizations such as the European Union (EU), African Union (AU), and SADC have funded NGOs’ programs and activities. Funds were channelled through the civil society organizations to foster development and improve service delivery at the grassroots level.
In the case of Kenya, donor agencies have reduced their funding of NGOs following the frequent political struggle and corruption affecting the government. This has led them to close down of some NGOs in Kenya due to a lack of funding and insufficient staffing levels. The common impact of financial dependence on donor funding is that once donors pull their financial support, NGOs collapse. As pointed out by World Vision (2008), one of the remarkable threats to their existence and the carrying out of their mandates is the reduced funding which may force them to scale down their activities.

Most NGOs in Africa and Kenya in particular, lack clearly defined structures in terms of organizational charts, buildings, facilities, equipment, and human resources. The major contributory factor to this is the constraint that limited financial resources places on the ability of NGOs to enable, plan, organize, and design clearly defined structures as well as equip their offices with adequate equipment and facilities. As noted by Molomo and Somolekae (1999), the key weakness of NGOs in Africa is the inappropriate organizational structures, which affect the manner in which NGOs carry out their core business. However, World Vision is one of the most well established and longest surviving NGOs and it has an organizational structure that links various programs and activities to the centre, and supports human resource requirements (World Vision, 2008).

Another issue of concern is that M&E system is often seen as a statistical task or a tedious external obligation of little relevance to those implementing the project; and it’s common to see projects separating the monitoring function from the evaluation function (IFAD, 2002). In such cases, the higher-level, impact-related assessments are sub-contracted and the project focuses only on tracking short-term activities, thus limiting opportunities to learn if they are having a strategic input. This therefore means that M&E system should be seen as an integrated support to those involved in project implementation by creating M&E processes that lead to clear and regular learning for all those involved in project strategy and operations;
understanding the links between M&E and management functions; using existing processes of learning, communication and decision-making among stakeholders as the basis for project-oriented M&E, and putting in place the necessary conditions and capacities for M&E to be carried out.

2.4 Summary and Research Gaps

Monitoring and evaluation systems have different roles especially in the management sector of any organization (Segone, 2008). An effective M&E system contributes to organisational and global body of knowledge, promotes participation of stakeholders in the management of projects, improves performance and quality of projects and provides information and facts that promote effective project management (Shapiro, 2002).

However, all the above benefits shall not be achieved without proper M&E systems in place. Wholey and Hatry (1992) suggested that evaluating the results in any project requires us to have a working enabling environment in place. A clearly articulated project plan forms part of an effective M&E system that includes M&E framework with clear objectives that are realistic and consistent with beliefs, ideology, schedule, resources, and general direction of the initiative and time-specific. This is because specific dates are normally set for achievements of milestones and achievement of final objective (Katia, Lima, & Lopez, 2010).

Others include; technical capacity and infrastructure to supply M&E, and stakeholders participation. These are essential ‘drivers’ to launch and resource the M&E exercise; lead the change in organizational culture that may be needed; provide the champion(s); deflect resistance to the introduction of M&E and the changes that this might imply; and, provide the basis to help ensure that the M&E system is sustainable over the long term. Nevertheless, despite all these development and uses of monitoring and evaluation systems, some gaps need to be filled in order for the tool to demonstrate full satisfaction in the area of applications.
NGOs playing in the same field need further research to be carried out to validate the determinants and challenges of M&E systems so that when one needs to apply, they know exactly what needs to be taken care of.

This will enable the organization to concentrate on the weak areas of the project and eventually leading to improved performance of the organization as a whole. For example as noted above, one of the major challenges of managing NGOs in Kenya is the reduced financial support from donors and other international institutions. There is, therefore, a need to empower NGOs with the ability to source funds for M&E systems to work.

2.5. Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a logically developed network of interrelationships among variables deemed to be the integral part of the dynamics of the situation being investigated (Serakan, 2003). For this study, the framework explains how the project plan, technical capacity, enabling environment and stakeholders influence the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems of non-profit projects.

Figure: 2.1 Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td>Effectiveness of M&amp;E systems of non-profit Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>- Easy assessment of projects progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling environment</td>
<td>- Accountability in projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' participation</td>
<td>- Understanding and capacity of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managers have information for day-to-day decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key stakeholders have information to guide project strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Early warnings of problems in projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Involvement of primary stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2012)
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section describes various methodologies that were used in collecting information, procedures adopted in conducting the research, the techniques used in analysis and the presentation of findings. The chapter focuses on the research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, and data analysis techniques used in the study.

3.2 Research Design

The researcher adopted a descriptive research design for the study. Descriptive research involves gathering data that describe events and then organizes, tabulates, depicts, and describes the data collection (AECT, 2001). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), descriptive research determines and reports the way things are. Descriptive research design is rated as one of the best methods for conducting research in human contexts because of portraying accurate facts through data collection for testing hypothesis or answering questions to conclude the study (Mwangagi, 2012). Thus, descriptive research is a suitable design for this study because it will determine and describe the determinants of effective project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

The study focused on a case of international nongovernmental organisations in Nairobi. According to Saunders et al (2009), a case study can be a very worthwhile way of exploring existing theory and can also challenge an existing theory. They argue that to answer research questions and to meet objectives, you may need to undertake an indepth study that focuses on a small case selected for a particular purpose. Thus, a case study approach is appropriate for
this study because it will help the researcher to gain a rich understanding of the context of the study and the processes being enacted.

3.3 Target Population

The target population for this study composed of 146 International NGOs based in Nairobi (NCB, 2009). According to the NCB report, there are 367 International NGOs operating nationally, and 40% of which are based in Nairobi. This implies that out of 367 international NGOs operating nationally, the target population for this study was 146.

The target population was made up of either project monitoring and evaluation officers or project managers.

3.4 Sampling Strategy

Simple random sampling method was employed for selecting a sample from the target population of 146 international NGOs based in Nairobi.

The sample size for the study was 73 respondents; that is 50% of the target population, selected randomly from international NGOs based in Nairobi; with either project manager or project monitoring and evaluation officer drawn from each NGO.

The inclusion of project managers in this study was based on the fact that they are responsible for all aspects of a project including monitoring and evaluation and thus an important source of information for the study. Project monitoring and evaluation officers are project staff other than the project manager partaking in M&E activities including; designing, implementing and reporting. They understand M&E and are in a good position to provide the required data for the study (IFAD, 2002).
3.5 Research Instruments and Procedure

A closed ended structured questionnaire was used to gather data from the random sample drawn from the target population.

To enhance response rate, confidentiality and propriety of information; the researcher asked for permission from relevant authorities to be allowed to undertake the research, and respondents were informed of the significance of the study and its intended contributions. The data collection process was conducted by the researcher and no service of a research assistant was required.

The data collection instruments were pretested to ascertain their validity and reliability. The instruments were then amended accordingly, and thereafter adopted for the study. The International NGO used for this process was not part of the main study.

3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

The data collected was analysed with the aid of a Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, version 16.00). Descriptive statistics, especially measures of central tendency (frequency) were run to generate results that were presented using tables and charts based on the objectives and questions of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The chapter analyses the data and presents findings on the determinants of effective project monitoring and evaluation systems for non profit project. Analysis of data was made possible with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS).

4.2 Background Information

This section deals with response rate and background information of the respondents on gender, age, level of education and experience in project monitoring and evaluation.

4.2.1 Response Rate

The study targeted 73 respondents but 53 respondents managed to respond to the questionnaire, translating to 72.6% of the response rate. This is regarded adequate in line with the literature by Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) which recommends 70% as a good response rate in descriptive studies.

Figure 4.1 Designation in the Project

Source (Research data, 2012)
From the figure above, 22.6% of the respondents were Project Managers and the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Officers represented 77.4% of the response rate. This implies that most of the respondents were well versed with project monitoring and evaluation activities and thus the information they provided in the questionnaire is accurate.

4.2.2 Gender

Respondents were also asked to state their gender. Figure 4.2 below gives the distribution of respondents by gender.

Figure 4.2 Gender Distribution

![Gender Distribution Chart]

Source (Research data, 2012)

According to figure 4.2, 60.4% of the respondents were male and 39.6% female. The implication is that project monitoring and evaluation activities are dominated by the male personnel.

4.2.3 Age Distribution

The age component was also considered in this study because in itself it reflected the authority of project monitoring and evaluation in a respondent. The respondents were asked to state their age ranges as shown in the figure below.

41
Figure 4.3 Age Distribution

Source (Research data, 2012)

From figure 4.3 above, the majority of respondents (47.2%) were aged 25 - 35 years old, followed by 36 – 45 years with 32.1% and Above 45 years at 17%. Two respondents were below 25 years old at 3.8%. These results reflect that the majority of the respondents were youthful; a component that is vital for project monitoring and evaluation systems to be effective.

4.2.4 Level of Education

Respondents were also asked to state their academic level. According to the figure below, most of the respondents had a Bachelor’s degree at 73.6%, 15.1% had a post graduate training, 9.4% high school and only one respondent had a Diploma at 1.9%. 
Level of Education was considered for this study because project monitoring and evaluation is a technical aspect of the project that can only be carried out by people who had previous experience and advanced training. The results in figure 4.4 show that most of the respondents were well qualified and thus their responses could be relied upon.

4.2.5 Experience in Project Monitoring and Evaluation

The respondents were also asked to state years of experience in project monitoring and evaluation work for non-profit projects. Most of the respondents (41.5%) had experience ranging from 3 – 5 years, above 5 years at 32.1% and 1 – 2 years experience at 26.4% as shown in the figure below.
According to the results in figure 4.6 above, most of the respondents had experience in project monitoring and evaluation activities. The results indicated that a larger number of respondents had a good experience in project monitoring and evaluation activities and thus they were a good source of knowledge for the study.

### 4.3 Project Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statements on how the project’s plan contributes to the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects.

#### Table 4.1 Project Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project M&amp;E system is Part of project plan</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness in Deciding activities</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Tool</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves quality of M&amp;E system</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Research data, 2012)
From table 4.1 above, 66% agree, 30.2% strongly agree and 3.8% neutral on the statement that project monitoring and evaluation system is part of the project plan. While on how the project plan is helpful in deciding project monitoring and evaluation activities, 71.7% of agree, 26.4% strongly agree and 1.9% were neutral. On the statement that a project plan is a communication tool that project management uses to communicate with project stakeholders, 57.7% agree, 34.6% strongly agree and 7.7% neutral. Lastly, 47.2% agree, 43.4% strongly agree and 9.4% neutral to the statement that a project plan when used well by project management can improve the quality of project monitoring and evaluation systems.

From the above analysis, it is clear that a project plan is an important part of the project monitoring and evaluation system because it is helpful in deciding project monitoring and evaluation activities, acts as a communication tool for project stakeholders, and it can also improve the quality of project monitoring and evaluation system.

4.4 Stakeholders’ Participation in Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Another focus of the study was on how stakeholders’ participation in monitoring and evaluation activities can influence the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems of non-profit projects.
Table 4.2 Project Stakeholders’ Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ varied levels</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and manage all project stakeholders</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can advocate and authorise changes to the project</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can fund a project based on information from effective M&amp;E system.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Research data, 2012)

First, respondents were asked to state their level of agreement on the statement stakeholders have varied levels of influence on project monitoring and evaluation activities. The results in table 4.2 above indicated 56.6% agree, 41.5% strongly agree and 1.9% neutral. While on identification and management of all project stakeholders, 60.4% agree, 37.7% strongly agree and 1.9% neutral. On stakeholders can advocate or authorize changes to the project based on information from effective project monitoring and evaluation system, 54.7% agree, 34% strongly agree and 11.3% neutral. Lastly, that stakeholders can fund a project based on information received from effective project monitoring and evaluation system, 47.2% strongly agree, 45.3% agree and 7.5% were neutral.

This results show a majority of respondents agree that project stakeholders’ participation on monitoring and evaluation activities is a key determinant in ensuring an effective project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects.
4.5 Project Technical Capacity to Supply Monitoring and Evaluation

The study also considered how project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation can influence the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems of non-profit projects.

Table 4.3 Project Technical Capacity to Supply Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of credible information gathering systems</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of skilled project staff</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of policies and standards</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A well established organisational units</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Research data, 2012)

The first consideration was existence of information gathering systems. In table 4.3 above, 58.5% agree, 26.4% strongly agree and 15.1% remained neutral. On the statement that availability of skilled project staff, 52.8% agree, 47.8% strongly agree and 1.9% were neutral. While on existence of policies and standards, 52% agree, 45.3% strongly agree and 1.9% neutral. Lastly, 75.4% strongly agree and 24.5% agree with the statement that well established organisational units can positively influence project monitoring and evaluation system.

Therefore, a majority of respondents support the view that existence of credible information gathering systems, availability of skilled personnel, existence of organizational policies and procedures and well established organisational units are very important for an effective and efficient project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects.
4.6 Project Enabling Environment

In this thematic area, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements on how project enabling environment influences the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

Table 4.4 Project Enabling Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political will and leadership</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resource</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Communication Technology (ICT)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled project personnel</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Research data, 2012)

From table 4.4 above, 60.4% agree, 34% strongly agree and 5.7% neutral with the statement that political will and leadership are essential to support values and ethics of project monitoring and evaluation system. On the statement that investing in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) enhances the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system, 69.8% agree, 30.2% strongly agree and 5.7% neutral. On the availability of financial resources 60.4 % agree, 39.6 strongly agree and 5.7% neutral. While on recruitment of skilled project personnel indicate 58.5% agree and 41.5% strongly agree.

Thus a majority of the respondents share the view that political will and leadership, availability of financial resources, investing in information and communication technology, and recruitment of skilled project personnel are essential in building an effective project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit project.
4.7 Challenges in Project Monitoring and Evaluation System

In this section, respondents were asked about challenges encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects.

Table 4.5 Results on Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak interest and commitment to project M&amp;E activities</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak culture of carrying out, sharing, discussing and using M&amp;E results</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative shortage of M&amp;E specialists</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited funds allocated for M&amp;E work</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Research data, 2012)

According to the results in table 4.5 above, 58.5% agree and 41.5% strongly agree that weak interest and commitment to project monitoring and evaluation system is a challenge encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects. On weak culture of carrying out, sharing, discussing and using project monitoring and evaluation results, 62.3% agree, 35.8% strongly agree and 1.9% of the respondents remained neutral. While on limited funds allocated for project monitoring and evaluation work, results show 62.3% agree and 37.7% strongly agree. Relative shortage of professional M&E experts indicates 66% agree, 32.1% strongly agree and 1.9% remained neutral.

From table 4.5 above, a larger percentage of respondents either agree or strongly agree that weak interest and commitment to project monitoring and evaluation system, weak culture of
carrying out, sharing, discussing and using project monitoring and evaluation results, limited funds allocated for project monitoring and evaluation work, and a relative shortage of professional M&E experts are some of the challenges encountered in designing and implementing effective project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit project by international nongovernmental organizations in Nairobi.

4.8 Project M&E System Determinants

In this section, respondents were asked to rank the suggested determinants for effective project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects. A majority of respondents ranked the project enabling environment as the most important followed by stakeholders’ participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities. Next was the project capacity to supply project monitoring and evaluation information, and project plan was last as indicated in table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6 Ranking of Project M&E System Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ Participation in Project M&amp;E activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project capacity to Supply M&amp;E information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Research data, 2012)
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the research findings and conclusions that will be drawn from the data analysis performed in chapter four. The chapter will try to explain whether or not the study achieved its main objective of establishing the key determinants of an effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects. The study will end with recommendations reached. The recommendations provided here are fundamental as they assist one know which part of the study may be embraced or boosted in order to make sure monitoring and evaluation is positively executed effectively.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The study findings are summarised based on the study objectives themes which include the project plan, project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation information, project stakeholder's participation in monitoring and evaluation activities, and project enabling environment.

The study revealed that the majority of development personnel who undertake project monitoring and evaluation activities or manage projects are male at 60.4% while the females are a distant 39.6%. It also revealed that most of the project monitoring and evaluation activities are undertaken by persons who at least hold bachelors degree at 73.6% compared to those with a post graduate training at 15.1%, high school certificate at 9.4% and 1.9% with a diploma training.
However, the study indicated that most of the project personnel responsible for project monitoring and evaluation activities are experienced to undertake the project monitoring and evaluation activities successfully. A majority (41.5%) had experience ranging from 3 – 5 years, above 5 years at 32.1% and 1 – 2 years experience at 26.4%. Lastly, most of the respondents for the study were project monitoring and evaluation officers at 77.4% compared to 23.6% project managers.

5.2.1 Project Plan

One of the objectives of the study was to establish how the project plan influences the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. Therefore, based on this objective, 66% agree with the statement that project monitoring and evaluation system is part of the project plan, 30.2% strongly agree and 3.8% neutral. This argument is in line with Shapiro’s (2002) assertion that project monitoring and evaluation enable project management to assess the quality and impact of their work, against their action and strategic plans. The results also revealed that a project plan is helpful to project management in deciding project monitoring and evaluation activities with over 71.7% level of agreement. In the same vein, the study revealed that a project plan that is comprised of the project monitoring and evaluation system is a vital tool for communication among different project stakeholders. This statement was supported by over 57.7% level of agreement.

Furthermore, the study revealed that a project plan when used well by project management can improve the quality of project monitoring and evaluation systems and this was supported by over 47.2% respondents. Thus, project monitoring and evaluation enables Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to make assessments from the start as they are being guided by a plan from one achievement to the next. It was also found that a project plan when used well by project management can improve the quality of project monitoring and
evaluation systems. This argument was supported by over 47.2% and 43.4% of the respondents who either agree or strongly agree respectively.

Therefore, this means that NGOs must understand that project monitoring and evaluation system is always part of a project plan and any form of poor planning is a clear indication that the organization will fail to achieve its intended objective. This will also result into wastage of project's resources due to lack of proper tracking system. That is why Jody and Ray (2004) support this argument when they say that project management has to ensure that it has appropriate plans in place with explicit project monitoring and evaluation system for their operations to be able to achieve its objectives at every step.

5.2.2 Stakeholders' Participation in Project Monitoring and Evaluation Activities

The research objective for the above theme was to determine the influence of project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. Based on the this objective, the study revealed that project stakeholders have varied levels of influence on monitoring and evaluation activities of a non-profit project with 56.6% and 41.5% agreeing and strongly agreeing respectively. It therefore means that stakeholders who include project donors, primary beneficiaries, staff, and government among others have varied levels of influence on the project monitoring and evaluation activities. This point is shared by Lahey (2004) that it is essential to have a clear understanding of the priorities and information needs of people interested in or affected by the project or programme. PASSIA (2002) adds that planning a project monitoring and evaluation system based on stakeholder needs and expectations helps to ensure understanding, ownership, and use of project monitoring and evaluation information by the project stakeholders.
It was clear from the study that for an effective project monitoring and evaluation system, it is important to identify and manage all project stakeholders. The results revealed 60.4% agree and 37.7% strongly agree. This implies that for a project monitoring and evaluation system to be effective, it is always important to identify and manage all project stakeholders. Initial assessment of project stakeholders can inform project monitoring and evaluation planning, with a focus specifically on the informational needs and expectations of the key project stakeholders.

On whether stakeholders can advocate or authorize changes to the project based on information from effective project monitoring and evaluation system, 54.7% agree, 34% strongly agree while 11.3% stated neutral. This means that stakeholders can advocate or authorize changes to the project based on information received from effective project monitoring and evaluation system. On whether stakeholders can fund a project based on information they receive from effective monitoring and evaluation systems, 47.2% strongly agree 45.3% agree and 7.5% remained neutral.

Like other international development institutions, NGOs have recognised that stakeholders’ participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities is essential to the achievement of their projects overarching objectives of poverty reduction and sustainable development (UNICEF, 2008).

5.2.3 Project Technical Capacity to Supply Monitoring and Evaluation

The objective was to determine the influence of project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. From the results, all respondents affirmed that project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation can influence the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems. However, on whether existence of credible information gathering
systems can influence the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system, 58.5% agree, 26.4% strongly agree and 15.1% indicated neutrality.

Furthermore, availability of skilled project staff was found to be vital for an effective monitoring and evaluation system. This argument was supported by 52.8% respondents who agree, 47.8% strongly agree and 1.9% remained neutral. When asked on the statement that existence of organizational policies and procedures helps project monitoring and evaluation systems to be effective, 52% of the respondents agree with the statement, 45.3% strongly agree and 1.9% stated neutral. On the statement that well established organizational units can positively influence project monitoring and evaluation system, 75.4% strongly agree and 24.5% agree.

Therefore, this means that project technical capacity includes both the existence of credible and relevant data and information-gathering systems as well as the skilled personnel to gather, analyse, and report on the performance of projects and programs (OECD, 2006). Thus, project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation information is needed to help ensure a systematic, comprehensive, and credible approach to project monitoring and evaluation system.

5.2.4 Project Enabling Environment

The project enabling environment became an important factor that influences the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. This is because of the fact that political will and leadership both being part of a project’s environment are essential ingredients for an effective project monitoring and evaluation system. That is why over 60.4% agree, 34% strongly agree.
It was also found out that availability of financial resources play an important role to effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system. This statement was overwhelmingly supported by a majority of respondents in the study. Furthermore, the existence of ICT facility too in a project enhances the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system.

In addition, the study found out that recruitment of skilled project personnel enhances effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems, that is why most (58.5%) of the respondents supported this idea. On the statement that weak interest and commitment to project monitoring and evaluation system is a challenge encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects, 58.5% of respondents agree and 41.5% strongly agree.

From the study, it also emerged that a weak culture of carrying out, sharing, discussing and using project monitoring and evaluation results is a challenge encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects. Furthermore, a relative shortage of professional M&E experts was also found to be a challenge encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects.

Another challenge encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects was limited funds allocated for project monitoring and evaluation work and was indicated by a majority of respondents in the study. This kind of argument is also shared by Kusek and Ray (2004). The two suggested that a project enabling environment is a fundamental requirement to ensuring a commitment to launch not only an operational project monitoring and evaluation exercise, but to sustaining it over the
long-term. They further said that the enabling environment translates into a commitment to resource such as funds and personnel to allow it to develop and mature.

Lastly, the respondents ranked the four determinants of an effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects according to their importance as project enabling environment, stakeholders' participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities, project capacity to supply project monitoring and evaluation information, and project plan.

5.3 Conclusion

From the study it can be concluded that a project plan can influence the effectiveness of a project monitoring and evaluation system if monitoring and evaluation is included or considered as part of a project plan in the early stages of project planning because project monitoring and evaluation activities are derived from the project plan. Khan (2000) argues that monitoring and evaluation are both tools which help a project or organisation know when plans are not working and when circumstances have changed and that it generates information it needs to make decisions that are necessary in strategy or plans. Jody and Ray (2004) add that managers for non-profit projects have to ensure that appropriate plans for project monitoring and evaluation are in place for projects to achieve set targets.

In addition, project technical capacity to supply project monitoring and evaluation information enhances the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. This is achieved by putting in place credible information gathering systems such as computers that directly support project monitoring and evaluation activities, ensuring availability of skilled personnel as a core component of project monitoring and evaluation system, existence of organizational policies, standards and procedures, and well established organizational units.
Furthermore, a project enabling environment influences the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects through a positive political will and leadership demonstrated by project management, investment in information and communication technology, allocation of adequate financial resources, hiring of skilled project personnel, and establishment of organisational values and policies that promote organisational interest and commitment to project monitoring and evaluation work. This is partly supported by Kusek and Ray (2004) that for a project monitoring and evaluation system to be effective, an organisation should have an enabling environment that commits resources such as funds and human resources to project monitoring and evaluation work. Wholey and Hart (1992) add that evaluating the results in any project requires us to have a working enabling environment in place.

Lastly, stakeholders' participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities contributes in the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. This is achieved by understanding that project stakeholders have varied levels of involvement in the project monitoring and evaluation activities, appreciating that stakeholders can advocate or authorise changes or fund a project based on information from effective project monitoring and evaluation and thus, they should be identified and managed for a project monitoring and evaluation system to deliver. PASSIA (2002) supports this view by asserting that planning a project monitoring and evaluation system based on stakeholders' needs and expectations helps to ensure an understanding, ownership and use of monitoring and evaluation information.

Thus, the determinants of effective project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects include project enabling environment, project stakeholders’ participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities, project capacity to supply project monitoring and
evaluation information, and the project plan. The effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system is evidenced through easy assessment of projects progress, accountability in projects, understanding and capacity of staff to undertake project monitoring and evaluation work, availability of project management information for day-to-day decisions, availability of information for key stakeholders to use in guiding project strategy, ease in detecting early warnings of problems in projects and full involvement of primary stakeholders in project activities. Shapiro (2002) states that an effective monitoring and evaluation system contributes to organisational and global body of knowledge, promotes participation of stakeholders in the management of projects, improves performance and quality of projects and provides information and facts that promote effective project management.

5.4 Recommendations

Project monitoring and evaluation practices and systems should not be seen simply in terms of developing systems and tools to plan, monitor and evaluate results, but must also include effective measures for promoting a culture of results orientation and ensuring that persons are accountable for both the results achieved and their actions and behaviour.

It is critical to set aside adequate financial resources to enhance effectiveness in project monitoring and evaluation. These resources should be considered within the overall costs of delivering the agreed results and not as additional costs. These should be estimated realistically at the time of project planning.

Human resources are also critical for an effective monitoring and evaluation system. Highly effective project monitoring and evaluation systems should have dedicated staff for monitoring and evaluation function. The staff should have required technical expertise in the
area of project monitoring and evaluation, and where possible training provided to equip them with relevant skills.

To enhance the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects, different project stakeholders are encouraged to have a culture of carrying out, sharing, discussing and using project monitoring and evaluation results. This should be coupled with organisations’ interest and commitment in monitoring and evaluation work.

Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) should also incorporate project monitoring and evaluation systems at the planning stages of the project. This contributes to quality in a project monitoring and evaluation system. By early planning for monitoring and evaluation, different project stakeholders are in a position to know in advance how the project performance will be tracked and assessed, and how they will partake in the monitoring and evaluation activities.

Furthermore, organisations should establish credible information gathering systems to enhance their project monitoring and evaluation systems. These information gathering systems include computers and computer programs that support monitoring and evaluation work.

Moreover, NGOs should in particular have organisational policies, procedures and standards to guide project monitoring and evaluation activities. This can be enhanced by a clear organisational structure that clearly illustrates the various specialised units in the organisation.

More importantly, project monitoring and evaluation is not a preserve of just a few project stakeholders. The organisations should involve different stakeholders in project monitoring and evaluation work to be efficient and effective. This can be achieved through identification,
analysis and management of the project stakeholders, and their needs and expectations taken into consideration for the project monitoring and evaluation.

5.5 Suggestions for Future Research.

To further understand the determinants for effective project monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects, the study suggests the following areas for further research:

1. A study on factors contributing to the low involvement of female staff in project monitoring and evaluation work. This is because the current number of women involved in either project management or project monitoring and evaluation activities is low.

2. A comparative study to investigate the extent project monitoring and evaluation systems differ between non-profit and profit oriented projects. A comparative study will help enhance the understanding and use of project monitoring and evaluation information.

3. Further research should also be carried out to include international nongovernmental organisations in the entire country. This is because the outcomes of this study were limited to Nairobi area.

4. Further research should also focus on how project monitoring and evaluation methodologies contribute to the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects.

5. Lastly, a study on the challenges that affect the effectiveness of project monitoring evaluation should be undertaken. This is because this study did not explore the challenges in details.
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APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire seeks information on the determinants of effective project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. The information given will be treated confidentially and for academic purpose only. Kindly respond to all items in the questionnaire by ticking appropriately.

1. Gender
   [ ] Male       [ ] Female

2. Age bracket (years)
   [ ] below 25   [ ] 25-35     [ ] 36-45     [ ] above 45

3. Designation
   [ ] Project Manager     [ ] Project Monitoring and Evaluation Officer

4. Academic background
   [ ] Postgraduate     [ ] Undergraduate     [ ] Diploma holder     [ ] High school
   [ ] others (state) ........................................................................

5. Number of years worked in project monitoring and evaluation related activities.
   [ ] less than one year     [ ] 1-2 years     [ ] 3-5 years     [ ] above 5 years

6. The table below represents how the project’s plan contributes to the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system. Please rate your level of agreement with the statement by ticking on the appropriate column according to the scale below.

   \[ SA - (Strongly Agree) = 5, A - (Agree) = 4, N - (Neutral) = 3, D - (Disagree) = 2, SD = 1. \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring and evaluation system is part of the project plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project plan is used to decide on monitoring and evaluation activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project plan is a tool used for communication with project stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A well designed project plan can improve the quality of project monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The table below relates to how stakeholders' participation in monitoring and evaluation activities influence the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems of non-profit projects. Indicate the extent you either agree or disagree with the statements by ticking on the appropriate column according to the scale below.

\[ SA - (Strongly Agree) = 5, A - (Agree) = 4, N - (Neutral) = 3, D - (Disagree) = 2, SD = 1. \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders have varied levels of influence on the project monitoring and evaluation activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to identify all project stakeholders for positive influence on the project monitoring and evaluation activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can advocate changes to the project depending on project M&amp;E recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can fund continuation of the project based on the information provided by project monitoring and evaluation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. According to you, does the project technical capacity to supply monitoring and evaluation influence the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

9. If yes, indicate in the table below the extent you agree or disagree with the statements on how project technical capacity influences the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects by ticking on the appropriate column according to the scale below.

\[ SA - (Strongly Agree) = 5, A - (Agree) = 4, N - (Neutral) = 3, D - (Disagree) = 2, SD = 1. \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of information-gathering systems enhances the effectiveness of project M&amp;E systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of skilled personnel is vital for effective project monitoring and evaluation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of policies and procedures helps project monitoring and evaluation systems to be effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established organizational structure can influence the effectiveness of project M&amp;E systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The table below represents how enabling environment influences the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems for non-profit projects. Please rate your level of
agreement with the statement by ticking on the appropriate column according to the scale below.

\[ SA - (\text{Strongly Agree}) = 5, \ A - (\text{Agree}) = 4, \ N - (\text{Neutral}) = 3, \ D - (\text{Disagree}) = 2, \ SD = 1. \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political will and leadership are essential for a successful monitoring and evaluation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of financial resources contributes to effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in ICT enhances the effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of skilled personnel enhances effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In a scale of 1 to 4, rank the following determinants of effective monitoring and evaluations system for non-profit projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants of effective project monitoring and evaluation systems</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Capacity to Supply project monitoring and evaluation information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project enabling environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The table below relates to challenges encountered in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation system for non-profit projects. Please rate your level of agreement with the statement by ticking on the appropriate column according to the scale below.

\[ SA - (\text{Strongly Agree}) = 5, \ A - (\text{Agree}) = 4, \ N - (\text{Neutral}) = 3, \ D - (\text{Disagree}) = 2, \ SD = 1. \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak interest and commitment to project monitoring and evaluation systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak culture of using the results of project monitoring and evaluation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relative shortage of professional project monitoring and evaluation experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited funding for project monitoring and evaluation work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67