

DETERMINANTS OF PERFORMANCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS FOR COUNTY GOVERNMENT PROJECTS: A CASE OF MAKUENI COUNTY

Bonareri Janet Onsomu

Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management, University of Nairobi, Kenya

Dr. Kisimbii Johnbosco (PhD)

Lecturer, School of Open and Distance Learning, University of Nairobi, Kenya

©2020

**International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management
(IAJISPM) | ISSN 2519-7711**

Received: 2nd September 2020

Published: 17th September 2020

Full Length Research

Available Online at: http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajispm_v3_i6_162_180.pdf

Citation: Bonareri, J. O. & Kisimbii, J. (2020). Determinants of performance of monitoring and evaluation systems for county government projects: A case of Makueni County. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, 3(6), 162-180

ABSTRACT

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has progressively become a crucial component in project performance. This is especially because of the need to reduce failures of projects in the collaborative effort to address the socio-economic challenges that have kept the gap widening among rich and poor nations. Most of county government projects fail as a result of ineffective M&E, where best practices are not applied. The study determined the aspects that affect the smooth execution of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in the county government projects. The theoretical concepts that enlightens the study are dynamic capabilities theory, the theory of change and the program theory of evaluation, which forms the basis of assessing the relationships between the role of management, human resources capacity, funding and stakeholder participation in ensuring successful M&E activities in Makueni County projects. The blueprint plan that the investigator followed was a descriptive design. In responding to the research quest, a sample of 245 persons clustered into two groups, one comprising of 200 project committee personnel and the other group of 45 county staff, were statistically enrolled as research subjects. From this population the researcher randomly sampled 100 project committee elected members, representing 50%, and purposefully sampled 45 County staff, interviewed using questionnaires. The reliability and validity of the tools were

established through a test-retest technique over a period of two weeks in a sample of 14 elected committee members from Machakos County as a pilot where a Cronbach coefficient alpha of 0.825 (82.5%) was realized hence the instrument was reliable. The collected data was organised, cleaned and analysed using SPSS version 21 to generate descriptive and inferential statistics that were presented in tables, charts and narratives. Availability of funds, human capacity, role of management and stakeholder participation were found to correlate positively with the performance of M&E, with the associated coefficients being with correlation coefficients being 0.514, 0.347, 0.317 and 0.148 respectively. The associations between the predictor and response variables was presented in the linear regression model as $Y = 3.488 + 0.317X_1 + 0.347X_2 + 0.514X_3 + 0.148X_4$. The findings indicated that the County Government of Makueni allocated funds for M&E activities, but the funds were insufficient. The study further established that the human resource was not fully trained which affected their capabilities. On stakeholder participation, involvement was only conducted on lower level activities. The role of management was found to affect the monitoring and evaluation activities; no doubt however that a significant majority admit there is very limited support offered by the management involved in order to bolster the tracking processes.

Key Words: *monitoring and evaluation, role of management, stakeholder participation, funds, capacity building*

INTRODUCTION

The first Gantt chart that gave birth to modern project management was established in 1910 by Henry Gantt. The chart outlines the timelines set for achieving a set of activities. This guide project managers in monitoring the progress of the project activities with the set timelines. This was therefore the origin of monitoring and evaluation (Shapiro 2011). Projects are implemented within limited timelines and few resources and thus the success of projects is dependent upon how these resources are put to good use within the short timelines. To achieve this, project implementers and administrators have to effectively track the performance of the project at every level which in some instances may require a change in the way the project is implemented. This process is done through proper and timely collection of information and communicating the same.

Monitoring is the continuous process of collecting and analysing project data during the course of the project which helps inform the progress of the project activities against set targets. Evaluation is the intervallic collection of data at specific times of the project to assess the medium term and long-term performance of the project as well as to assess the characteristics of the project (Welsh et al., 2005). There are key attributes that are looked at in evaluating a project, such as the relevance of the project outcomes to the target population, the efficiency of the implementation process. In summary, evaluations describe the characteristics of the project. To assess these components, evaluation can be conducted as formative to inform the project and these are done mostly in the life of the project or summative which are done at the end of the project. Four approaches are adopted in evaluating a project which include, assessment of the knowledge, attitudes and practices, after action reviews or participatory assessments to assess the intentions expressed by the audience and behaviour changes in the short term and lastly policies initiated by the project (Hunter, 2009).

Implementation of M&E in project management is guided by four kinds of frameworks. Logical framework presents the linkage between activities to outputs, outcomes and the impact with clear indicators for measuring them and their means of verification in a matrix form. Theory of change on the other hand is the logical presentation of the project and a strategy on how to achieve the desired project impact. In addition, a conceptual framework may be used by project managers to comprehensively understand the relationship between the different outcomes and activities of the projects. Lastly is the result chain which typically links the different result levels in a matrix form (Hunter, 2009). Therefore, such a system that shares info and integrates outcomes with a view of enhancing prevention and response plan, is a combination of these tools and the resources needed to implement them including the human resource, ICT materials, logistics and the buildings to accommodate the M&E team (Chaplowe, 2008).

Governments, cooperate business and non-governmental organizations around the world endeavour to support the nations achieve sustainable socioeconomic development. This calls for greater accountability through evidenced based programming through rigorous M&E.

Countries like USA, China, and Germany have employed policies to standardize result-based programs for sustainable development through building robust M&E systems (Koffi-Tessio, 2012).

The constitution of Kenya decentralizes activities and responsibilities to the Counties. This included allocation of funds to implement development projects. These counties have implemented several development projects with huge investments. However, the success of these projects in achieving the desired goals have not come out clearly pegging the question on whether evidence of the project performance is tracked and documented. This has seen cases of misappropriation of funds and subsequent court cases on corruption in the counties with unfinished or substandard projects. In order to clearly understand implementation of result-based programs in the counties, the present study sought to assess the influence of M&E on the performance of county government projects, with a focus in the devolved public offices in Makeni.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

According to Kusek & Rist (2004), a number of establishments view the component of M&E as a donor prerequisite and not as a vital factor in their internal control systems. As a result, the design and implementation of the overview schemes are merely formal and intended to meet financiers demands and not to improve the current and future productivities and subsequent influences on beneficiary targets. A study by Nyonje, Ndunge & Mulwa (2012) also supports this position by noting that in spite of several studies providing evidence on the positive impact of monitoring and evaluation in program performance, a number of institutions have not adopted the same. This slow uptake is attributed to low confidence in M&Es impact in project performance. Equally, the information dearth in regard to the critical components of M&E: the role of management, stakeholder participation, availability of funds and capacity building influence project performance. Functions were decentralized to the counties so that the counties can implement socioeconomic and development programs to improve the wellbeing of the residents of those counties (GoK, 2012). The two levels of county government including the executive and legislature provide leadership and strategic steps to ensure these programs succeed in achieving the desired objective. Through the county integrated development plans, the counties outline the objectives and strategies to achieve those objectives in the form of a logical framework and it also captures the M&E approach for these programs. Despite all these interventions, and plans, ten years down the line there are a multiple inactive/incomplete project that have been launched by the governors and devolved leadership with allegations resulting in prosecution of some county leaders as a result of misappropriation of funds meant for these projects. This exposes the gaps in the impacts of M&E on the utilization of these county projects, which the study sought to assess.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The investigator intends to inspect the aspects that determine the performance of M&E activities on county government projects in Makueni.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To establish the role of management in performance of M&E systems for Makueni County Government projects
2. To evaluate the influence of human resource capacity on performance of M&E systems for Makueni County Government projects
3. To examine the effect of financial resources on the mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation in Makueni County Government projects
4. To assess the influence of stakeholder participation on performance of M&E systems for Makueni County Government projects

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Monitoring and Evaluation System

The notion of monitoring is a continuing process of information collection and analysis enabling comparison on effectiveness of a project, policy or program implementation against projected outcomes. This is aimed at providing stakeholders and project coordinators with constant feedback and early signals of advancement or their absence towards achieving envisioned outcomes (Adra, 2007).

According to Uitto (2004), evaluation is a structured methodical approach for assessing a project that is in progress with a view of realising the intended goals. M&E should offer comprehensive and related data that will be of great significance in decision making (Jody & Ray, 2004). Evaluation serves several functions such as providing information that informs the design and execution of processes of decision making, setting targets, budgeting, facilitation, workforce and (Mulwa, 2008). In addition, the project managers are in a position to learn from the past, thereby helping them to develop new skills and improve on future plans.

M&E system just like any other system is constituted by tools, techniques, resources and ideas working together to ensure that projects and programs are adequately monitored and results documented to inform their implementation (Kerzner, 2013). Documenting performance of the projects/programs are essential elements to ensure accountability and as a learning process for implementation of similar projects. This involves understanding the strength, weakness, opportunities and threats of the project (Spaulding, 2014).

Resources are therefore allocated to acquire materials in terms of information technology, vehicles, stationary, staffing and even to facilitate movement. Project managers will develop tools, policies, guidelines and techniques that will use the allocated resources to objectively

monitor and evaluate the projects with evidence (Nyonje, Kyalo & Mulwa, 2015). Some of these strategies are inculcated in the organizational policies, structures and SOPs informing allocation of resources, staffing and the communication structure. These components will work in tandem to form a system for ensuring project accountability. And effectiveness of this system will be evaluated by its ability to provide reliable information for project managers to make informed decisions regarding performance of the project (Briceno, 2010).

There has been evidence from previous studies that quite a few programs in Kenya have had successful M&E systems with as low as 39% having documented and published M&E results. The recommended funding allocation for M&E processes and activities per each project globally is 3%-5% which is not the case with many projects in Kenya including county and national government projects with quite a few, if any, having dedicated M&E staff/department.

M&E systems and policies should be integrated into the project management cycle and should remain in place even after the completion of the program. The constant streaming of vital data in the stages of design to implementation of the project by M&E systems provides valuable feedback to the management and as such, the impact of the program remains in check.

Role of Management Influence on Monitoring and Evaluation

Management influence is categorized in two forms. The first level is the top organizational or county management that is mandated to set up structures, policies and the funding strategies for the different sections and departments in the organization. They set the data needs and the data required as they are going to use that information (Care, 2012). They are thus the paramount strategists and policy makers with ability to influence assessment processes. In addition, this is the team mandated to approve M&E plans, SOPs, Policies and even reports for wider sharing and publishing. They inculcate the M&E culture in the organization among staff. For example, the director or chief executive officer of an organization is solely responsible for ensuring credible information about the organization projects is shared with evidence of the performance and lessons learnt and this has to be done efficiently through competent and well-resourced M&E (World Bank, 2011).

Secondly is the project implementation management team that puts the resources, structure, policies and procedures into play. This management does the regular and period collection of M&E data and information and analyses it to generate reliable and viable reports that that top organizational management can rely upon to make informed decisions (Gaitano, 2011). At some point, they are also the consumers of regular monitoring reports that informs them on the performance of the project in terms with the set work plan, budget and project performance targets. They entice the M&E staff through motivation, coaching and capacity building to effectively deliver their role. So project managers are like the heart of the M&E system that has to make it function.

Chaplowe (2008) opines that during the project cycle, the involvement of the management is akin to guaranteeing ownership, awareness and sustenance of results and thus gaps that may

arise are duly settled. The close partnership between the program managers and stakeholders promotes the frequent sharing of progress reports and thus the bottlenecks effectively sorted out. Moreover, it is the responsibility of senior managers, supported by project managers, to communicate results and information (Nyonje, Kyalo and Mulwa, 2015).

Management should ensure the existence of strategic frameworks that incorporate viable oversight, cooperation in creating the rules, accountability and commitment to the design of the system. Bloom, Standing and Joshi (2006) urges that accountability is a fundamental component of governance that concerns the relationships between management and different stakeholders who are responsible for the monitoring, financing and delivery of different services. In addition, the integrity of the program results is largely dependent on the M&E systems that assess their life cycle (Ben, 2002). According to UNDP (2000), good leadership puts emphasis on results and follow-up. It tracks the progress and records the report, and recommends and follows up with decisions and action.

Staff Capacity Influence on Monitoring and Evaluation

The project personnel who are rich in qualifications and management expertise are central for the generation of credible results. The World Bank (2011) supports this view by recommending that organizations need to build an efficient monitoring system together with evaluation approaches around qualified personnel. This is because the efficacy of such a scheme is largely influenced by the quality of the management workforce.

The capacity of staff employed to undertake M&E activities should match the desired objectives of the system (Iravo, 2013). At the minimum, the staff need to have background knowledge, skills and attitudes to implement the M&E processes set out in the system. At the minimum, these are set out in the recruitment job description of the staff and the human resource and recruiting team look for these qualities during recruitment. Once employed, the staff is taken through an induction process of the company policies, procedures and systems for them to understand their obligations.

Ngatia (2015) claims that for sustainability of M&E systems, building human capacity is paramount. In addition, M&E training and development both formal and informal is critical for objective monitoring and evaluation of programs because trainings lead to attitude change, knowledge and capacity to do a SWOT analysis of the project. An extensive training and induction are vital in building necessary skills that are essential for carrying out M&E. There are no quick fixes in training, it is long term and continuous. In addition, a number of administrative resources such as training manuals have been developed for NGOs staff so as to strengthen their awareness level in M&E (Hunter, 2009). These instructive resources have practical examples of ideal M&E settings and thus are useful in inculcating an efficient and effective culture that promotes positive impacts of projects undertaken (Shapiro, 2011).

After induction development needs of the staff are identified and a plan is drafted between the employee and the supervisor on how these needs are to be achieved. In line with the

development needs a participatory work plan between the employee and the supervisor is developed with periodic review to ensure the desires of the system are achieved.

To support the staff to achieve the set work and development plans, there are aspects that have to be checked and must work in harmony. The working environment is the first setup that allows the staff to actively deliver effectively and efficiently. For example, is there a well-equipped office for the M&E staff to operate from? Is the project implementation area safe for collection of M&E data? Is there support from the project implementation team for M&E staff? The second aspect is staff motivation. It is evident that well-motivated staff go an extra mile to deliver on what is expected of them (Irvo, 2013). In effect, when all these aspects come into play and qualified staff are employed, their delivery of M&E activities will be effective.

Availability of Funds Influence on Monitoring and Evaluation

According to Magongo (2004), M&E activities are independent to program happenings and as such, a separately clear budget line is needed to oversee the assessment events. Kelly and Magongo (2004) estimates that a proportion of about 5 to 10 percent of the program funds should be steered towards the establishment of an effective monitoring and evaluation unit. However, Gitonga (2012) points out that there is no explicit fraction that should be allocated for M&E but, depending on the project and the overall budget, it varies between 2.5% to 10%.

In essence, a fairly proportionate amount of project resources should be enough for credible M&E system, since the undertakings of monitoring should not jeopardise program goals in terms of resources. The cost of evaluation activities should be properly estimated and planned at the project design phase Chaplowe (2008). Mugambi and Kanda (2013) suggest that the allocation of resources for M&E activities should be undertaken in a controlled manner to ensure that it poses no challenge to the implementation of an organization's strategy.

With the devolution of activities to the counties, the counties enjoy some autonomy in managing their budgets and sourcing for funds. The counties are at liberty to impose charges as a means of collecting revenues they can use to implement projects (Gitonga, 2012). Availability of these funds will allow the organization to not only hire qualified M&E staff, but also source for supporting devices like computers, phones as well as procure office materials that will support M&E activities.

The Kenya Ministry of Finance's Public Finance Management Reform Coordinating Unit (PFMR, 2008), describes various tracking systems to be part of the overall administration toolkit. Every public department should have the three inter-related tier systems in charge of finance, human resource and accountability and should be tied to a proper feedback processing unit. A results-based M&E evaluation system is fundamentally a special public management tool that allows governments to measure and evaluate outcomes, and use this information for decision making and governance. In conclusion, it provides information on progress toward achieving the stated goals and targets to public sector managers. It also provides substantial evidence that may inform mid-way adjustments in policies and processes.

The global recommendation is for projects to allocate at least 3% of the project funding to support M&E activities (Mugambi and Kanda, 2013). However, over the years, concerns have been raised regarding the constraint funding for M&E activities with as low as 0% funding for M&E activities in the projects (Mushori, 2015).

Stakeholder Participation and Influence on Monitoring and Evaluation

Stakeholders can be internal or external who influence or are influenced by the project. They have direct or indirect influence on the performance of the project (UNDP, 2009). First, they are key in determining the needs of the beneficiaries that informs how the project is designed (Patton, 2008). This is a key activity for M&E in formulating the project. Secondly, they influence uptake of the project in the project area (Askari, 2014). In this implementation phase, M&E staff will be able to carry out their duties with ease and even gather information from these stakeholders in a participatory manner to triangulate the reports. As part of accountability, M&E will seek to have beneficiaries mobilized for regular interviews or even to respond to emerging compliments, complaints and issues, and this will solely be supported by the stakeholders.

External stakeholders will heavily contribute to the quality of surveys them being key informants and consumers of the reports for their references. Therefore, it is a prudent and cardinal call for project implementers to involve all the stakeholders at all levels of the project to have a successful project (Askari, 2014).

It was found out that stakeholder participation improves the quality of the programme and offers the opportunity to address local development needs. This creates a sense of ownership that promotes the likelihood of programmes and their impact sustainability. However, the involvement stakeholders vary depending on the design of evaluation systems as well as the established participatory approaches. UNDP (1997) states that in each instance, program managers are responsible for deciding which set of stakeholders should be involved in a given project, to what extent, and how. Nevertheless, the participation of stakeholders in evaluation of projects is determined by the evaluation questions and the circumstances. Stakeholder involvement in evaluations is mainly useful in coming up with solutions relating to implementation difficulties.

Different stakeholders are involved at different stages of the M&E process. Some of them may be involved making decisions while others only need to be informed on the process. Stakeholder involvement in the entire M&E process promotes the transfer of skills, development of skills and creation of shared knowledge and learning.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Dynamic Capabilities Theory

Teece, Pisano and Shuen (1997) define dynamic capability as the ability of organisations to incorporate, reconfigure and build upon functional competencies and resources available to them internally and externally, so as to deal with the constantly evolving environment. Barreto (2010) equally describes the concept as the capacity to efficiently unravel issues based on risk and gap analysis, and make objective decisions that are progressive and sustainable without realigning project resources. Generally, core competencies of dynamic capability should be applied in modifying short-term competitive positions that can then be applied in building longer-term competitive advantage. Building dynamic capabilities has a relationship with the organization's ability to strategize, its choice of organizational form and its established environmental and technological sensing apparatus. Big companies in size and assets normally remain afloat beyond crises as compared to smaller ones because of the tenets of stability that are considerable high. The unity and streamlined alignment of the several components of the system influences its effectiveness (Wang et al., 2007). This theory was deemed fit to guide this study in understanding the importance of adequate budgetary allocations for M&E schemes for operations and integration in the implementation of county projects.

Theory of Change

This theoretical model describes the strategies to achieve an anticipated impact (Perls, 2005). It described the steps required for a change to be realized. For instance, in implementation of county projects, the desired change is usually social and economic growth of the county residents. The theory of change, critically and objectively, outlines the set of processes and assumptions that will come into play to ensure the change is achieved. This includes implementation of M&E activities and the required resources. Rogers (2008) defines the concept as a set of abstract projections and assumptions about the program output by the stakeholders, based on the scrutiny of the present settings in regard to financial capacity, audit, community participation, decision making and tracing mechanisms. The model also forestalls the likelihood of unforeseen risks during the project phases and outline measures on how to address them amicably. This therefore makes the theory relevant for this study as it informs the program drivers the prospects and uncertainties that characterises the design, administration and implementation of project goals.

Program Theory of Evaluation

Program theory of evaluation was postulated by Donaldson in 2012. It evaluates the capacity of the program to attain its goals. The philosophical concept guides the validation processes of the projects cycle and highlights the crucial gaps that must be addresses in order to realise the projected impacts and outcomes. Equally, it also summarises the key management components

that need focused attention during the course of evaluation. The theory looks at the outcome of an M&E process in terms of providing valuable information that guides decision making in project implementation. It presents the importance of data gathering in decision making process (McClintock, 1990). The theory in its form does not however look at the allocation of resources to carry out the evaluations since it requires a lot of dependence on data collection to direct the assessment process, and this may be costly for projects working under tight budget.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This is a survey blueprint which informs the type of investigation processes in sourcing, processing and analysing data (Gorald, 2013). It describes the procedure and plans that is adhered to in responding to investigative queries. The investigator adopted descriptive research model. This type of model of data collection from respondents was convenient since it did not change the environment or manipulate any data or findings. It involved describing the subject of the study without influencing the conclusion. Hence, descriptive design focused on getting and giving accurate qualitatively and quantitatively evidenced information which was readily available for analysis.

Target Population

The entire group of elements under query makes up the target population. It may include individuals, objects, places and elements that may be the interests of investigations. Mugenda & Mugenda (2009) opines that they offer materials necessary for addresses the aspirations of the research. In regard to the survey, 245 individuals comprising of 200 community members elected to seat in the project committee and 45 staff from Makueni County government formed the study target population.

Sampling Procedure

145 respondents were sampled out of the respondents whom 100 are elected members of the project committee comprising 50% of the total elected members to the project committees. The 100 elected members were selected through a mix of stratified, purposive and simple random sampling. Another 45 respondents from the county staff were purposefully selected.

Data Collection Instruments

The main feedback tool that sourced the relevant first-hand information from the sampled respondents was the questionnaire. The research instrument contained sets of perception statements in which the selected PMC members were requested to indicate their views on a five-point categorical scale. This ensured that the tool captured diverse but vital opinions on M&E. Kombo and Tromp (2006) opines that questionnaires guarantees anonymity and privacy.

Data Collection Procedure

The basis of establishing the validity and reliability of the data collection tools was to correct and refine the tools as per the findings from the pilot study. Thereafter, the researcher recruited and trained two research assistants who helped with administration of the tools to the respondents. The assistants were introduced to the county officials during a courtesy call to seek permission to conduct the survey and where the permits and introduction letters from the Ministry of Education and University of Nairobi were presented and linkages established to trace the targeted respondents. Thereafter, the data collectors were issued with temporary identification documents and copies of the research permits for presentation in the event they are requested in the field while collecting data. During the actual data collection, the researcher dispatched the assistants to the field with periodic remote monitoring to ensure that the assistants collected data and any emerging issues were dealt with in time. The filled questionnaires were collected on a daily basis and a briefing done with the assistants to establish any challenges and or emerging issues.

Data Analysis Techniques

The collected facts and figures were arranged into sub-categories, cleaned and corrected in order to eliminate outliers. After the cleaning, SPSS Ver.22 was used to perform the descriptive and inferential statistical analysis, which generated frequencies and percentages. The outcomes were presented in means, standard deviation and percentages. Linear regression equation and Ordinary Least Square method of estimation were used in the study to cultivate the relationship between the independent and dependent variables at 95% CI. The collected data was modelled and transformed with the help of Excel and SPSS to generate frequencies in tables and charts that are interpreted to answer the research questions (Sharma, 2005).

RESEARCH RESULTS

Role of Management

The study established that the management played a key role in providing consulting and decision-making for the monitoring and assessment process as shown by the results (mean score = 4.108; standard deviation =0.699). The management also played an important role in communicating and perceiving monitoring and evaluation results, (mean score=4.022, standard deviation 0.780). In addition, the respondents were neutral in that the monitoring and assessment system could not be designed without the management of the county administration, (mean =3.495; standard deviation =0.802). Finally, the outcomes reveal that the roles that management plays are crucial for an effective M&E arrangement with regression outcomes (B=0.317, p-value =0.031).

Human Resource Capacity

The investigation notes that 40.9 percent of the participants agreed that there was adequate skilled human resource capacity. In addition, the results discovered that staff competency significantly shapes the M&E input in project outputs and impacts. Equally, the investigations reveal that trainings feature greatly in enhancing the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, (mean =4.022, std =0.642). The regression analysis produced (B=0.347, p=0.000), proving that a reliable workforce in terms of qualification, competence and size, was crucial for an effective assessment and analysis of undertakings of the devolved governments.

Availability of Funds

The study found out that the majority of the funds were from the government as indicated by 41.9% of the respondents. 29.0% indicated donor/sponsor funds and 19.4% indicated CDF. Also, 9.7 percent of the respondents indicated sourcing funds from the community. The findings indicated that the chief financier in most projects was the government. A moderately strong correlation was also revealed between the availability of funds and Monitoring and Evaluation, (r=0.514, p<0.05).

Stakeholder Participation

The study indicated that 61.3 percent who were the larger part of the respondents involved outside stakeholders whereas 38.7 percent did not. The regression coefficient for stakeholders' participation is 0.148 at significance level of 0.031<0.05, showing that the association between stakeholders' participation and performance of monitoring and evaluation of county government projects is significantly positive.

INFERENCE STATISTICS

Table 1: Model Summary

Model	R	R-Squared	Adjusted R-Squared	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.814 ^a	.663	.660	.46045

The R-Squared characterises the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (effective Monitoring and Evaluation) that is described by the independent variables. The R-squared (0.663) that the investigations produced shows that the four factors of interest (role of management, human resource capacity, availability of funds and stakeholder participation) explained 66.3 percent of M&E level of performance, revealing that other aspects are responsible for the unexplained 33.7% of the response variable.

Table 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.065	4	.266	18.545	.000 ^b
	Residual	17.729	88	.187		
	Total	18.794	92			

The ANOVA analysis determine the relevance of the model in the interpretation of the data. Research has shown p-value to below 0.000 and accepted the model used in evaluating how the efficacy of monitoring and evaluation of county government projects is influenced by the independent variables (management function, personnel efficiency, availability of resources and involvement by stakeholders). The F-calculation (18.545) was further more than the F-critic (2.46) meaning the model was adequate for studying the effect on monitoring and evaluation performance on county government projects from management's roles, human resources capacity, availability of resources and stakeholder participation.

Table 3: Regression Coefficients of Independent Variables

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.488	.884		3.947	.000
Role of management	.317	.063	.115	5.032	.031
Human capacity	.347	.048	.463	7.229	.000
Availability of funds	.514	.090	.560	5.711	.000
Stakeholder participation	.148	.053	.059	2.792	.031

From the outcomes presented, the regression equation becomes:

$$Y = 3.488 + 0.317X_1 + 0.347X_2 + 0.514X_3 + 0.148X_4$$

The analysis reveals that the four metrics of performance positively influenced the efficacy of M&E activities. As indicated in the summary above, there is a significant benefit in allocating funds to the departments accountable for monitoring operations and evaluating outcomes and impacts (B=0.514, t=5.711, p=0.000). The results therefore prove that the level of success of M&E processes is directly linked to the finances allocated.

The regression coefficient for human capacity was 0.347 (t=7.229, p=0.000), indicating that human capacity significantly affected the efficiency of monitoring and evaluation. As such, the results posit that the personnel dimension is vital for an effective and efficient M&E of county government projects.

In addition, the regression coefficient for the predictor “role of management” is 0.317 (t=5.032, p=0.031), implying that the management do have a role in the efficacy of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. As such, the results postulate that the equipping the administration

better is likely to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of M&E of county government projects.

Lastly, the regression coefficient for the predictor “stakeholder participation” is 0.148 ($t=2.792$, $p=0.031$), implying that investor engagement is important for a functional and efficient monitoring and evaluation system. As such, the results assume that the involvement of all the relevant players in the M&E frameworks is important for the attainment of outcomes and impacts.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Role of Management in Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation

The study showed that managers guarantees the success of assessment undertakings. The Management played a very key role in providing advice and decision-making in the M&E process and it also ensured that results were communicated and perceived. In addition, it showed that designing of the system of monitoring and evaluation could not be successful without the hand of county government management. Lastly, the study established that county government management did not put emphasis on ensuring that monitoring and evaluation resources were well allocated and did not offer adequate strong supervision and direction to those conducting M&E. Management therefore has a duty in creating the best possible environment for employees and stakeholders to consistently review the outputs and impacts of the county, since they offer guidance (Shapiro, 2011). The World Bank report (2011) also supports the view that program managers’ commitment is vital in ensuring the tracking units are well resourced. Without the support and goodwill from the management of an organization, the system would be poorly designed and operated and thus ineffective. Khan (2003) suggested that all managers and leaders in an organization need to develop interest in the aspects of assessment, since it directly affects their effectiveness.

Human Resource Capacity

The analysis proved an association between human capacity and performance of monitoring and evaluation. It was found out that the human resource was well trained which improved their capabilities which was vital for effective M&E. Experts played a major role in providing functional advice and training which are central factor in enhancing the outputs of operational processes. Still, some personnel disagreed that the county government placed great emphasis on qualifications of individuals during the recruitment process of Monitoring and Evaluations personnel. Sufficient training on monitoring processes and evaluation techniques is very vital in ensuring the systems established achieve their objectives. It training helps the team in understanding the theory and linkage between project theory and results as well as associated indicators (CPWF, 2012). Human capital with skills in project management is fundamental in selection and execution of M&E system (Nabris, 2002). As a result, there is a big demand for

skilled personnel, harmonization of training programs, capacity building of M&E frameworks and technical advice (Gorgens and Kusek, 2009).

Availability of Funds

The analysis indicated a presence of a positive connotation between funds and performance of the systems in charge of monitoring operations and progress and assessment of results and goals. In the departments the researcher visited, none was found to commit between 5 to 10 percent of their budgets to M&E as recommended by Kelly and Magongo (2004). As recommended by Chaplowe (2008), the findings indicated that the associated M&E departments were not allocated adequate resources in the budgets and would not plan effectively their related operations. Furthermore, contrary to the recommendation of Gyorkos (2003), it was observed that the monitoring units lacked independence.

Stakeholder Participation on Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation

The investigations revealed that the inclusion of donors in the assessment undertakings contributed positively in the realisation of outputs and impacts. Stakeholder participation is key in determining the needs of the beneficiaries that informs how the project is designed (Patton, 2008). The findings showed that an increase in stakeholder contributions in participatory and assessment aspects directly influence the performance of such programs. Askari (2014) cautiously advises that while the inclusion of stakeholders is very vital, excessive involvement could result in undue influence on the process. It is therefore proper to communicate efficiently their roles. Knowledge is created through close involvement of stakeholders throughout the entire process of M&E that enhances ownership of results and helps in capacity development and transfer of skills (UNDP, 2002).

CONCLUSIONS

The investigations observe the following; the efficacy of schemes that measure outcome and impacts, is mostly reliant on the commitment of managers to appoint competent workforce that is qualified to gather information, process, analyse and communicate so as to inform the decision making of project operations. As such, the competency of the staff is vital to take part in designing of the M&E system for county governments.

In regard to human capacity needs, the study posits that a considerable proportion of county government staffs in charge of project operations and outputs are well versed with what M&E is and its relevance to program outputs and impacts as they have been trained. The research hence indicates that staff competency is a vital component in the execution of M&E activities in county government community ventures.

Further, the study concludes that a competent and qualified workforce positively influence the processes of judging productivities and influences on beneficiaries.

The investigator settles that a significantly positive relationship exists between resource allocation and performance of the system under focus. The decentralised units of public service rely on the central government funds and as such, the M&E departments are underfunded and mostly not prioritised in the budgets, thus the potential of the processes are greatly inhibited.

Finally, the research-undertakings settles that stakeholders' participation had an influence on M&E. Identification of stakeholders must be done early enough and engage them in the planning and designing stages which informs them in regard to participation as the plan for Monitoring and Evaluation is implemented. Incorporating stakeholder's views in relation to planning and design plays a critical role in success of monitoring and evaluation process. It was also concluded that lack of sufficient involvement in data collection for M & E influences the end results in a negative way.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings from the study on the influence of role of management, human resource capacity, availability of funds and stakeholders' participation on the performance of M&E, it is recommended that:

1. When undertaking monitoring and evaluation, the management should be at the forefront in providing advice and decision making in the M&E process.
2. The current staff should be trained in order to fully participate the planning and execution of M&E of county government projects. When recruiting monitoring and evaluation staff, their competencies should be based qualifications and knowledge in monitoring and evaluation process.
3. There should also be proper policies on allocation of adequate funds meant to facilitate the M&E process.
4. Stakeholders' participation should be controlled effectively by developing a system of identifying and managing stakeholders in the M&E process.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. (2005). *An Introduction to Theory of Change*. The Evaluation Exchange, Volume XI Number 2, P. 12
- Askari, G. R. (2011). *Factors Influencing Effective Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices in Donor Funded Projects in Kenya: A Case of Turkana District*. (MBA Research Project, Kenyatta University, 2011).
- Bakewell O. and Garbutt A. (2005). *The Use and Abuse of the Logical Framework Approach*. SIDA
- Briceno, B. (2010). *Defining the Type of M&E System: Clients, Intended Uses and Actual Utilization*. Premnotes.
- Capable Partners Program (2012). *Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system overview*. NGO Connect news, Issue 46. Capable Partners Program (CAP).
- Chaleunvong K. (2009). *Training Course in Reproductive Health Research: Data collection techniques (PowerPoint slides)*. GFMR – WHO – UNFPA - LAO PDR.

- Chaplowe, Scott G. (2008). *Monitoring and Evaluation Planning: American Red Cross/CRS M&E Module Series*. American Red Cross and Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Washington, DC and Baltimore, MD.
- Chesos R. (2010). *Automated M&E system for NGOs*. The Co-Ordinator, Issue No. 5, p. 1.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2008). *Business Research Methods*. London: McGraw Hill Higher Education
- CPWF. (2012). *M&E guide: Theories of change*.
- Fitzgerald M., Posner J., Workman A. (2009). *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of NGO Capacity Building Interventions in Conflict Affected Settings*. JSI Research and Training Institute, Inc.
- Gaitano, S. (2011). *The Design of M&E Systems: A Case of East Africa Dairy Development Project*. A paper presented at INTRAC 7th Monitoring and evaluation conference
- GoK (2012). *Social Protection Sector Review*. Republic of Kenya
- Gorgens, M. and Kusek, J. Z. (2009). *Making Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Work*. World Bank.
- Guijt, I., Randwijk and Woodhill, J. (2002). *A Guide for project M&E: Managing for Impact in Rural Development*. International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), Office of Evaluation and Studies (OE)
- Hosley, C. (2005). *What's Your Theory – Tips for Conducting Program Evaluation - Issue 4*. Wilder Research
- IFRC. (2011). *Project/programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide*
- James, C. (2011). *Theory of Change Review: A Report Commissioned by Comic Relief*. Comic Relief
- Jaszczolt K., Potkanski T., Stanislaw A. (2010). *Internal Project M&E System and Development of Evaluation Capacity – Experience of the World Bank – Funded Rural Development Program*. World Bank.
- Jha, Abhas K.; Barenstein, J. D.; Phelps, P. M.; Pittet, D.; Sena, S. (2010). *Safer Homes, Stronger Communities: A Handbook for Reconstructing after Natural Disasters* (pp. 269-284). World Bank.
- J-PAL (2003). *Program Theory Assessment*.
- Kameri-Mbote, P. (2000). *The Operational Environment and Constraints for NGOs in Kenya: Strategies for Good Policy and Practice*. IELRC Working Paper 2000-2. International Environmental House.
- Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 30 (Acts No. 18), (2013). *The Public Benefits Organizations Act, 2013*. The Government Printer, Nairobi.
- KOFFI-TESSIO B. (2002). *Efficacy and efficiency of Monitoring-Evaluation (MES) for Projects Financed by the Bank Group*. African Development Bank Group.
- Kusek, Jody Zall and Rist, Ray C. (2004). *A Handbook for Development Practitioners: The Steps to A Result-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. The World Bank, Washington. DC
- Levison, F. J., Rogers, B. L. Hicks, K. M., Schaetzel, T., Troy, L., Young, C. (1999). *Monitoring and Evaluation: A Guidebook for Nutrition Project Managers in Developing Countries*. Prepared for the World Bank, Human Development Network by International Food and Nutrition Centre Tufts University School of Nutrition Science and Policy
- Mackay, K. (2010). *The Nuts & Bolts of M&E Systems*. Washington, D.C. The World Bank
- Makueni County Integrated Development Plan, 2013

- Mathias J., Senelet P., Topcuoglu E., Kose R. and Tsui A. (2001). *Best Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation: Lessons from the USAID Turkey Population Program*. USAID
- Mugenda, O. M. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. Nairobi, ACTS,
- Nabris, K. (2002). *Monitoring and Evaluation. Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA)*
- Naidoo, I. (2013). *All UN Agencies Vet and Monitor their Work*. Daily Nation, P.
- Oso, R.K and Onen N.N. (2009). *Essential of Nursing Research (5th ed.)*. Philadelphia: Lippincott
- Otieno, L. (2010). *Good governance in NGOs*. The Co-Ordinator, Issue No. 6., p. 10.
- Perrin, B. (2012). *Linking Monitoring and Evaluation to Impact Evaluation. Impact Evaluation Notes*, No. 2.
- Radhakrishna, R. B. (2007). *Tips for Developing and Testing Questionnaires/Instruments*. Journal of Extension, 45(1).
- Raval, K. (2009). *Stratified Random Sampling*.
- Seith, S. and Philippines I. (2012). *Evaluation and Theory of change. Presented at workshop on randomized evaluation to improve financial capability innovation for poverty action*
- Shapiro, J. (2011). *Monitoring and Evaluation*. CIVICUS.
- Sharma, A.K. (2005). *Textbook of Correlations and Regression*. New Delhi, India: Discovery Publishing House.
- UNDP (2002). *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results*. UNDP, Evaluation office
- UNDP (2009). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. UNDP, USA.
- Warah, R. (2013). *UNDP's Shortcoming a Reflection of a Wider Failure with the UN System*. Daily Nation, P. 12
- Welsh, N., Schans, M. and Dethrasaving, C. (2005). *Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Manual (M&E Principles)*. Publication of the Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Programme
- William R. (2009). *The History of Project Management*.
- World Bank (2002). *Monitoring & Evaluation: some tools, methods and approaches*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.