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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify major problems of managing educational projects, which are designed and implemented by various NGOs in Addis Ababa and provide possible solutions. The study included 1-3 educational projects from each sub-city and was delimited to 20 educational projects. Regarding the research design, the research method used was descriptive survey method, while random, quota, purposive and availability sampling techniques were employed to select 20 education projects, 120 project personnel and 120 direct project beneficiaries from the implementing NGOs and 4 project experts and officials from Addis Ababa Education Bureau and Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGO’s Affairs team. The data-collecting instruments used were questionnaires and unstructured interview, whereas percentage was used for data analysis.

According to the findings, technical problems such as poor project identification process, technically unsound objectives etc; human resource related problems like short number of project experts, lack of training, motivation problems etc; funding and financial problems including inadequate fund, delayed release of fund and cost overruns; lack of support and acceptance; little or no attention to M&E; poor participation of concerned stakeholders etc were the major bottlenecks encountered while managing the projects.

Therefore, it was concluded that the problems could adversely affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the education projects’ management and lead to less achievement of the projects’ objectives. In order to alleviate and curb the problems, it was recommended that the implementing NGOs should manage the projects as effectively and efficiently as possible by employing advisable and appropriate project management strategies, creating good relationship with the education bureau and the donor agencies and involving concerned community members and other stakeholders in all stages of the projects, while the education bureau, the donor agencies and umbrella organizations like CRDA should provide the necessary technical assistance to the NGOs.
CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

1.1. Background of the Problem

It is widely believed that education plays a vital role in the socio-economic development of countries. This belief is rooted in multiple merits of the sector to growth and development. As Aggarwal (1997:3) states, if the pace of national development is to be accelerated, there is a great need for determined and vigorous action to utilize, improve and expand education.

Similarly, Baum and Tolbert (1985:119) point out that education is a basic human need, a means of meeting other basic needs and an activity that sustains and accelerates overall development. This is because education makes individuals more productive and able to contribute to the development of the local and national economy i.e. it enhances human resource development (HRD), which is a central objective of and means to development (Gould, 1993:146).

In considering this, both developed and developing countries invest in education so as to gain high rate of social, economic and political returns. To get such returns, the need for quality education i.e. improvement of the educational process and its outcomes is indispensable. In this regard, the role of effective and efficient educational management whose demands rising steadily and steeply is decisive.

Adequate management performance helps not only to progress but also to keep the existing level of quality from being doomed to decline. Drucker (1999:5) writes: "From the peak there is only one easy way to go: downwards. It always requires twice as much effort and skill to stay up as it did to climb up".

Nevertheless, developing countries suffer from inadequacies of managerial capacity in the education sector, which are part and parcel of the overall problems of national administrative, managerial, and analytical capacity (Baum and Tolbert 1985:139). It is
obvious that such limitations pull back the countries not to implement their educational policies, which are hopefully made to improve the sector and speedup the overall development.

Some people might confuse between possessing a good policy and its implementation. However, it is important to understand that having an attractive and feasible educational policy by itself is not an end. It is rather a means to an end i.e. the policy should be implemented in such a way that it meets the desired objectives. In this regard, the role of management is crucial. This is because the process of implementing a policy without adequate management is unthinkable. It is like trying to drive a car whose engine is taken out.

The traditional educational management, however, may not be in a position to realize the effective implementation of policies. As a result of this, both decision makers and administrators are now interested in a more pragmatic and less doctrinaire approach i.e. more attention is now being paid to the programs and projects, which flow from policies. Magnene (1991:11-12) further explains:

> Projects are one of the best ways for decision-makers to gain control of it (implementation of education policies). Because their objectives, budgets and implementation periods are clearly defined. For this reason, Ministries of Education as well as sources of external assistance are resorting to projects more and more frequently.

As it is cited, nowadays both concerned governmental and non-governmental organizations are focusing on projects to improve the education system through which development needs can be addressed.

Since the project approach is preferable to achieve important development objectives, developing countries like that of ours ought to give due attention to the management of various educational projects. Hence, in order to take appropriate measures and build up adequate managerial capacity, it is essential to identify different managerial
drawbacks that adversely affect the efficiency and effectiveness of educational projects.

That is why this study focuses on the management problems of education projects designed and currently implemented by different non-governmental organizations in Addis Ababa city administration.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

It is widely believed that the project approach is useful to speed up and improve the investment process. However, no matter how a project has significant ideas, its development benefits cannot be fully realized, if it is not properly managed and implemented (Shihata, 2000:9). In order to make proper execution that is to the success of projects management plays a vital role. Briyant and White (1982:126) state, “Good project management is the single most important variable affecting a project’s outcome”.

Nevertheless, managing projects is not an easy task that can be done without difficulty. With regard to education, leave alone the particular project management that requires different specialist concepts and techniques, the general managerial capacity of the education ministries in many developing countries is weak. Because the higher level managers in such ministries are usually former teachers without managerial training (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:144).

Besides, the management of projects is somehow different from the normal management and involves specialized forms of organization and methods of planning. The reason is that the traditional forms of management techniques do not handle project type work effectively. In other words, training and experience in general management are not sufficient for effective project management which requires special knowledge and methods (Harrison: 1983: 1&3, Anderson and others (1997:29).
In developing countries like that of ours, many people working on projects receive little or no education or training in project management. As a result, the same mistakes are made again and again and the success of projects is adversely affected. Moreover, many projects suffer from lack of clear definition or organization structure, delays and over expenditure and lack of special project oriented information system and these are mainly the results of poor project management (Harrison 1983:1, 3-5).

It is not a secret that such kinds of problems are common in our country too. A significant number of educational and other development projects are facing difficulties in achieving their goals and objectives due to managerial and other related reasons.

Currently, excluding other regional states of the country, there are various educational projects undertaken by the government, bilateral and multilateral organizations and NGOs in Addis Ababa. However, most of such projects are not also free from managerial problems that negatively affect their execution.

Since most of the problems are related to the overall capacity of the implementing agencies, it is not difficult to understand that educational projects undertaken by NGOs meet more problems than projects implemented by experienced multilateral organizations like UNICEF, ADB etc. This is because some NGOs have limited financial and management expertise and institutional capacity (World Bank, 1996:157; Berhanu, 2004: xii).

The main reason why the student researcher is concerned with this part of the country is twofold. On one hand, as quoted by Berhanu (2004:59), unlike other parts of the country the number of educational projects designed and implemented by NGOs is relatively very high (21.9 %). On the other, even though it is the education bureau that appraises the projects, most of the implementing agencies are local NGOs, which may lack experience and/or ability to manage educational projects as effectively and efficiently as possible (Berhanu, 2004: 62-63).
Hence, the purpose of this research study is to identify major problems in managing educational projects which are designed and implemented by various non-governmental organizations in Addis Ababa city government, and provide possible solutions so as to enhance the effectiveness of the education project management in the region.

In respect to this, the following basic questions are treated in this study:

1. A large part of project identification and preparation work aims at minimizing project management problems. How do these NGOs identify and prepare educational projects?

2. If objectives of the project are clear and consistent with the National Education Policy, project management can be easier. Hence, are objectives of the projects (designed and implemented by the NGOs) clearly set out and consistent with the existing education policy of the country?

3. What are the major project appraisal problems? Does the Addis Ababa education bureau have adequate and qualified personnel who can appraise the educational projects submitted by the NGOs?

4. What are the common problems faced by the organizations while managing implementation of the projects?

5. What are the main managerial problems in relation to monitoring and evaluation of the projects?

6. Are there efforts made by the education bureau to facilitate and improve the management of Educational projects designed and implemented by such agencies?

7. Do the agencies involve local community and other concerned bodies in all stages of the projects' cycle and manage the projects according to the education policy and their agreement with the bureau?
1.3. Significance of the Study

Good project management is one of the most important factors that positively affect the outcomes of a given education project. On the contrary, poor educational project management leads to the wastage of human, financial, and material resources. Hence, any attempt that contributes to the reduction of managerial problems and/or to the improvement of educational project management can have a significant role in the general growth of our education system.

Accordingly, this study will have the following major contributions:

1. It will help to understand the general present situation of educational projects, which are designed and implemented by NGOs in Addis Ababa City Government.

2. It will help to identify managerial problems of the educational projects so as to take appropriate measures and minimize/resolve the existing bottlenecks.

3. The results of this research will provide some insights and feedback for the Education Bureau, the implementing NGOs and concerned donor agencies so that they improve the management of the current and future educational projects.

4. The findings of this investigation may also generate interest for concerned Research Institutes or other researchers who want to conduct an in-depth study on this particular area.

1.4. Delimitation of the Study

There are two major educational projects, which are undertaken by UNICEF in Addis Ababa namely Primary Education Initiative and Complementary Education Initiative under program operational manual. The African Development Bank also carries out a project on school building construction.
These projects, however, are beyond the scope of this study due to various reasons. First, the same projects are undertaken in all regions by the same organizations and the case of Addis Ababa alone may not indicate the overall features of the projects. Secondly, since UNICEF and ADB are huge and experienced organizations that have better managerial expertise and Institutional Capacity, the difficulties faced by the projects might be less in comparison with other projects. Thirdly, some researches were undertaken on such projects at national level.

Hence, the study is delimited to those educational projects designed and implemented by NGOs in the capital so as to attain its purpose. Currently there are 31 educational projects undertaken by 21 local and 7 international NGOs. The projects have diversified focus areas including Non Formal Basic Education, Technical and Vocational Training, Kindergarten Education, Special Education, School Construction and HIV/AIDS Education. Most of the NGOs work in one sub-city, whereas some of them operate in more than one sub-cities (Kifle Ketemas) of the metropolis.

According to the present administrative structure, Addis Ababa has 10 sub-cities. Therefore, in order to define the scope to a manageable size, the study includes at least one and at most three educational projects from each sub-city and is delimited to the following 20 educational projects:

Table 1; The Education Projects included in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of NGOs</th>
<th>Project Intervention</th>
<th>Sub City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Action for Self Reliance</td>
<td>Non Formal Basic Education</td>
<td>Nifas Silk-Lafto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amanuel Development Ass.</td>
<td>Non Formal Basic Education</td>
<td>Akaki Kaliti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>Special Education for Deaf</td>
<td>Nifas Silk-Lafto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Environment Development Action</td>
<td>Non Formal Basic Education &amp; Basic Skill Training</td>
<td>Yeka, Arada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emanuel Home</td>
<td>Kindergarten Education</td>
<td>Akaki Kaliti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Good Neighbors</td>
<td>Kindergarten Education</td>
<td>Lideta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Islamic Relief Or</td>
<td>Technical &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Kolfe-Keranyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kidane-Meheret Students S.As</td>
<td>Employment Generating skill</td>
<td>Arada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maedot</td>
<td>Non Formal Basic Education</td>
<td>Addis Ketema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mary Joy</td>
<td>Integrated HIV/AIDS Education</td>
<td>Gulele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Life Community</td>
<td>Basic Learning</td>
<td>Gulele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Plan Ethiopia</td>
<td>Non Formal Basic Education</td>
<td>Arada, Yeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Proprid</td>
<td>Non Formal Basic Education</td>
<td>Addis Ketema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Save the Children - USA</td>
<td>Reproductive &amp; Sexual Health</td>
<td>All Sub Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Save Your Generation</td>
<td>Computer &amp; Basic Secretarial T.</td>
<td>Gulele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SAW Ethiopia</td>
<td>Public awareness on Animal</td>
<td>All Sub Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Selam Children Village</td>
<td>Technical &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Yeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SOS Children Village</td>
<td>K.G. Teachers Training</td>
<td>Kolfe-Keranyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>St. Mary Vocational Skill Trai.</td>
<td>Vocational Skill Training</td>
<td>Arada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wusate Berhan Abera</td>
<td>Music Training for Visually</td>
<td>Arada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>impaired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such delimitation is appropriate, because the investigation involves all parts of the capital and most (two-third) of the educational projects designed and implemented by the NGOs.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

The study has some limitations including the following: first, since it is conducted in Addis, it is impossible to generalize the findings at national level. Secondly, although most of the respondents cooperated, some of them were not as such willing to answer the open-ended question items in the questionnaires. Further more, few of them took relatively long period of time to fill in the questionnaires. As a result, the data analysis was made in relatively short period of time.
1. 6. The Research Design and Data Collecting Method

1. 6. 1. Research Method

It is very necessary to systematically describe the problem under study so as to find out major problems and various causes of the problems that adversely affect the management of educational projects. Therefore, the appropriate research design used was the descriptive survey method, which helps to explain the problems in such a way that constructive solutions will be forwarded.

1. 6. 2. Sampling Techniques

Since the study is delimited to 20 educational projects, one to three projects i.e. implementing NGOs were selected from each (10) sub-city based on random sampling techniques. Assuming that each responding organizations has at least 6 concerned personnel involved in the management of the projects, the estimated total population was 120 \((6 \times 20 = 120)\) and all \((100\%)\) of them were included in the study as a sample population, that is to say 120 respondents were chosen by employing availability sampling technique. This is because the project personnel are the most important group of respondents to spell out the various problems encountered during the management of the projects.

Secondly, 120 individuals from the direct beneficiaries of the projects were chosen based on both quota (six from each project) and random sampling techniques so as to gather relevant data regarding their participation in the projects. Furthermore, in order to collect additional information, two concerned officials and project experts from the Addis Ababa City Administration, Education Bureau and other two from Addis Ababa Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGOs’ Affairs team were selected by using availability sampling technique.
1. 6. 3. Data Gathering Tools

The main data-collecting instruments used were questionnaires. Two types of questionnaires made up of both close-ended and open-ended question items on the research problem were prepared for two different groups of respondents i.e. project personnel and direct beneficiaries. This was because the questionnaire is the most appropriate tool to reach all people included in the sample. The close-ended question items of the questionnaires also enable respondents fill in the questionnaire without difficulty, while the open-ended question items allow them to express their own ideas on the issue.

In addition to the questionnaires, interview was used to gather information from the horse's mouth (directly responsible persons) that is from four concerned officials and project experts of Addis Ababa Education Bureau and Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGOs Affairs team. The interview technique is helpful to address small number of respondents and to raise various additional questions on the issues that can be difficult to be included in other types of data collecting tools like questionnaires.

1. 6. 4. Procedures of the Study

Before distributing copies of the questionnaires among the respondents, the questionnaires were pilot tested at small scale by involving three of the NGOs included in the study. This tryout helped the student researcher to test the validity of all the items in the questionnaires and improve them accordingly. As a result, the questionnaires were revised by correcting and even changing some question items so as to make them clear, relevant and feasible based on the feedbacks obtained through the pilot test and given to the concerned respondents so that they fill in and return them back.

Accordingly, out of 120 copies of the questionnaire distributed among project personnel only 110 (92 %) and out of 120 copies of the questionnaire given to direct beneficiaries only 114 (95%) copies were filled, returned and used for analysis. However, all of the interviewees from Addis Ababa City Administration Education
Bureau and Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGO's Affairs team cooperated with the student researcher by providing the available information.

**1. 6. 5. Data Analysis Method**

After gathering the necessary data, the findings were properly tallied, tabulated, analyzed, interpreted and summarized so that conclusions and recommendations would be forwarded. Among various methods of data analysis, percentage was used. This is because the student researcher believes that percentage can be adequate to analyze the data and convey the information in simple and understandable way.

**1. 7. Definition of Terms**

**Design**- Refers to the planning i.e. identification and formulation (preparation) of a project in all its dimensions – technical, economic, financial, social, institutional and so on (Bryant and White, 1982:110).

**Implementation** – Is a project stage, which covers “the actual development or construction of the project, up to the point at which it becomes fully operational” (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:334).

**Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs)** – Are different organizations, varying enormously according to their purpose, philosophy, sectoral expertise and scope of activities and usually engaged in development and poverty reduction work at local, national and global levels around the world (Lewis, 2001:1; World Bank, 1996:158).

**Project** – “A project is a set of investments and of other planned activities aimed at achieving specific objectives with in a predetermined time frame and budget” (Magnen 1991:14; Baum and Tolbert, 1985:333).
Project Management – Is traditionally associated with the implementation phase of a project but it includes all stages of project cycle from pre-identification through evaluation (Amdeberhan, 2004:7).

1.8. Organization of the Study

This study encompasses four chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and its approach, while the second chapter contains the review of related literature. The third chapter consists of presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data collected, whereas the last chapter deals with the summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This part of the thesis deals with the review of important literature that is directly related to the purpose of the study and the research (basic) questions raised in the first chapter.

2.1. The Concept of Development Project and Its Management

As many writers in the area agree, a project approach is relatively new and its management also involves concepts that differ from the normal one. Baum and Tolbert (1985:6) explain this situation:

_The notion that investment can and should be planned and executed in the form of specific projects is itself relatively new. Although the use of the term project, in the general sense of plan... for doing something, can be traced back for several centuries, it is only in the post war period (1950s) that development practitioners and academics have focused on projects as the unit into which investments could be packaged._

In order to understand what makes the project approach unique and how it is managed, it is essential to make clear what a project is and why it is needed.

2.1.1. Definition of a project

There is no a commonly accepted definition of project i.e. various writers define project in different ways. For instance, Baum and Tolbert (1985:333) define a project as "a discrete package of investments, policies, and institutional and other actions designed to achieve a specific development objective (or set of objectives) within a designated period." Similarly, Magnen (1991:14) writes: "a project is a set of investment and of other planned activities aimed at achieving specific objectives within a predetermined time-frame and budget." Dingle (1997:4-5) also presents various definitions of project by quoting different authorities. The following are some of them. Project is:
• "A set of inter-related tasks that are undertaken by an organization to meet defined objectives, that has an agreed start and finish time, is constrained by cost, and has specified performance requirements and resources." (The association of project managers/UK).

• "Any undertaking with an established starting point and defined objectives the achievements of which clearly signifies the completion of the project" (PM Institute/USA).

• "A unique set of coordinated activities, with definite starting and finishing points, undertaken by an individual or organization to meet specific objectives within defined schedule, cost and performance parameters" (British standard).

As we have seen above, although the concept is similar a project can have various definitions. Hence, the better way to define and understand a project seems not to choose one of the definitions given, it is rather to outline the common characteristics that a project might be expected to have.

Therefore, when we summarize the above definitions, a project can have the following common characteristics:

➢ It is a set of activities/tasks/ undertakings which involve the investment of resources in the expectation of future benefit.
➢ It has define/specifc objective/s.
➢ It has predetermined time frame i.e. starting and finishing time.
➢ It has predetermined budget and/or input resources.
➢ It has a conceptual boundary i.e. geographical and/or organizational boundary (Gittinger, 1982:5).
➢ It can be undertaken by an individual, an organization or a group of individuals or organizations.

Similarly, Andersen et al (1997:2) generalize the characteristic features of a project in such a way that it is used as a definition of a project. Accordingly, a project is a
unique task; is designed to attain a specific result; requires a variety of resources and is limited in time.

Hence, each project is unique by its objectives, schedule, budget, resource, performance etc. Besides, as a significant number of people may think, project is not only foreign source oriented. Although a major part of external aid to developing countries is supplied through projects, there are also projects entirely financed by a nation, a region or an organization (Magnen 1999:15).

2.1.2. Programs and Projects

Some people frequently use the terms “project” and “program” interchangeably. In fact, both of them are means of implementing a national, regional, local etc. plan, which are driven from a general development policy or a sectoral policy like that of education. However, projects and programs are distinguished by their size and duration.

As defined by Duncan (1996:8), a program is “a group of projects managed in a coordinated way to obtain benefits not available from managing them individually.” According to Magnen (1991:15), the word “program” refers to a series of planned activities with a broader scope than a project. Unlike projects, programs do not necessarily include investments. The domain of activity of a program can be an entire sector (for example education), or a sub sector (primary education), or a major function of the system (the elaboration school curricula and textbooks). The execution period of a program is often longer than that of a project. A program may consist of a set of projects, aimed at achieving several related objectives.

In other words, both programs and projects are packages of action in which the plan has to be elaborated or broken down. And a program is a bigger package of action, which composed of a number of related projects, where as projects are the building blocks of programs (Amdeberhan, 2004: 3-4; Little and Mirrlees, 1982:3; Cleand and King, 1983:189).
Table 2 summarizes the differences and similarities between projects and programs.

**Table 2: Differences and Similarities Between Projects and Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Is specific in objectives</td>
<td>☑ Has got general objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Has specific area/geographic unit</td>
<td>☑ May not have specific area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Has specific target groups</td>
<td>☑ May not have specific target groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Has clearly determined and allocated fund</td>
<td>☑ May not have clear and detailed financial allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Has specific life</td>
<td>☑ May not have specific time of ending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Similarities**
- Have purpose/objectives
- Require input (financial, manpower, material etc)
- Generate output (goods or services)
- Operate over space and time

*Source: Ethiopian Management Institute, Training Manual, 2004*

### 2.1.3. Importance of Projects

Projects generally help to rationalize the implementation of development policies. Although the project approach has some limitations, it has a significant advantage in providing a logical framework and sequence within which data can be compiled and analyzed, investment priorities established and policy issues addressed. Moreover, it enables to make immediate decision so as to solve problems and promote better coordination and cooperation (Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 335; Magnen 1991:19 and Gittinger, 1982:8-9).

According to Winson and Lindblom (in HAPCO 2003:6), it is appropriate to use projects when the task:

- Is complicated.
Is new and difficult to be handled.

Involves several organizations and/or units and demands cooperation.

Is cost intensive and requires special follow up.

Is to be done within a definite period of time.

Is limited and specified.

Demands broad and active participation.

2.1.4. The Concept of Project Management

Brown and Moberg (in Ayalew, 1991:1) define management as “... marshaling both human and material resources towards common organizational goals”. Other writers simply define management as “getting things done through people”. Based on this definition of management, Dingle (1997:2-3) says: “project management is getting things done on time, within budget, and properly, through people”.

According to Magnen (1991:109-110), since management is to have certain tasks carried out by others in order to achieve a common goal, project management consists in coordinating the activities of different departments, groups and individuals who contribute to its execution, in such a way as to achieve the established objectives.

As far as functions are concerned, project management includes systematic planning of all activities involved, efficient organization, continuous coordination, skillful operation, motivating, periodic monitoring and control etc (Dharwadker, 1996:37; Duncon, 1996:167; Mylor, 1996:3 etc).

As we have seen above, even though different authorities define project management differently, most of them agree that unlike the normal management, project management involves specialized forms of organization and methods of planning and control (Harrison, 1983:1-3; Anderson et al, 1997:28-29; Martin, 1976:4 and 30).
2.2. The Management Approach to the Project Cycle

Projects usually go through a series of identifiable stages. Many scholars describe these stages as the project cycle. However, on one hand, they use different terms to describe the various stages or phases, and on the other, different authors develop different models of the project cycle in relation to their organizational perspectives.

Table 3 depicts some of the models of the project cycle developed by different writers:

**Table 3: Some Models of the Project Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th><strong>Martin 1976</strong></th>
<th><strong>Baum and Tolbert 1985</strong></th>
<th><strong>Magnen 1991</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dingle 1996</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Concept phase</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Organization phase</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Operational phase</td>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Completion phase</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Retrospective Evaluation</td>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Post project evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Close down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For our purpose, however, it is better to follow the five stages of the project cycle developed by Baum and Tolbert for it seems more generic and convenient.

In terms of boundaries, the distinctions among the various stages of the project cycle, especially the earlier ones may not be too clear because the same issues may be raised and addressed, with different degrees of detail, as the project advances through the cycle (Baum and Tolbert 1985:335).

As far as management is concerned, it is important to understand that the project cycle is a process that should be managed properly. Traditionally, management is associated with the implementation phase. In fact, as Magnen (1991:109) states, it is the crucial
function of this stage. However, the management is not only restricted to the implementation, but also includes all stages of the project cycle. In other words, each stage of the cycle needs decision making so that the project is modified and reshaped to achieve the desired objectives (Amdeberhan 2004:7, Weiss and others, 1977:10).

2.2.1. Managing Identification of a Project

Project identification is the first phase of the project cycle and is concerned with identifying project ideas, describing, screening and prioritizing them so that relatively best projects are selected to move into the next stage.

According to Amdeberhan (2004:2) this stage of the project cycle involves four key phases:

1. Actual Project Identification

Project ideas can be generated by government, NGOs, formal and/or informal organizations, individuals etc. There are also diversified sources of project ideas. Generally, we can distinguish two sources or events i.e. the macro level such as national policies and plans, general surveys, constraints etc. and the micro level such as unsatisfied needs (high demand) etc. A distinction is sometimes made between demand or need-based projects and resource-based projects (Rondinelli, 1977: 9-10).

With regard to the identification of education projects, Magnen (1991:45-6) states: “The purpose of identification is to make a selection among several projects, and opt for those that are justified by indisputable priorities, that are in line with national policy orientations, and that seem likely to be feasible”.

Sometimes people (organizations) are directed to design a particular project because the donor agency has already made a determination about the problem to be addressed. Whatever the case, some writers like Bryant and White (1982:110-115) advise to use problem tree-diagram so as to specify components of a problem.
2. Description of Project Idea

After a project idea is conceived (identified), it needs to be well described so that it can be prioritized. This phase may involve the preparation of project identification report/project concept/project brief/project profile, which clearly shows justification, purpose, beneficiaries and/or stakeholders, resources ... of the project, policies and plans addressed by it and impacts of and support for the project etc.

As noted by Baum and Tolbert (1985:342-343), a project brief is designed not only to concretize what we have in mind but also to identify and reach early agreement with donor agencies (if it is financed by donors). And the brief should consist of developmental objectives and features of the project, institutional and policy issues as well as steps necessary to prepare the project and the human and other resources to be employed.

3. Project Screening

Project screening is an initial review of project ideas and concepts to see if they should be advanced or abandoned at an early age. A project idea can be rejected due to inappropriate technology, excessive risk, inadequate demand for the proposed output, inadequate supply of raw materials, over ambitious design, excessive costs and lack of commitment and support (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:341; Dingle, 1997:18-19).

4. Prioritization

Prioritization is the ranking and selection of projects against a set of criteria to identify relatively most important projects to move into formulation stage. Some of the criteria for ranking projects include the extent to which number of people and geographic areas affected by the project; economic, financial, environmental and social benefit of the project; its relationship with the existing national or sectoral policy; availability of resources and support etc.

To be more specific an education project can be justified by:
- A high priority need of the society like high demand by parents for new primary school.
- The need to solve a serious problem confronted by the education system such as poor achievements of students.
- Availability of enough human and financial resources for the implementation of the project etc.

Therefore, before identifying and prioritizing projects, it is necessary to analyze the educational situation, its socio-economic context and the government’s policy (Magnen, 1991:46).

To sum up, at this stage (identification) of the project cycle, various project ideas are identified, described and screened and the relatively best one is selected based on the prioritization criteria. Nevertheless, the selected project needs to be reviewed and reshaped/modified as it goes the next phases of the project cycle.

2.2.2. Managing Preparation/Formulation of a Project

Preparation or formulation of a project is the second stage of the project cycle, which involves the detailed planning of the project idea and is characterized by refining project objectives and the means of achieving them.

To make better project preparation that reduces the likelihood of implementation problems, additional information, consultation and inputs from local officials and concerned members of the community etc is required (Bryant and White, 1982:117). However, the information that will be gathered should be in line with the purpose of the phase.

As described by Magnen (1991:58), the two essential goals of preparation are presenting the project in detail for appraisal by financing decision-makers and planning its implementation for proper achievement of the expected results. Hence, this phase of the project cycle includes pre-investment i.e. pre-feasibility and/or
feasibility studies and drafting of the project document (proposal) with associated objectives and the detail technical elaboration.

Nevertheless, feasibility studies (technical, socio-political, financial, institutional, economic... feasibility analysis) can vary according to the nature and size of the projects. The practice of conducting such studies is also mainly applied to large, capital intensive projects such as dams, power plants and major highways etc. As a result, smaller projects may not be the subject of such studies for their size and features do not justify the preparation of a feasibility study (Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 349; Rondinelli, 1977:11).

Whether or not a large feasibility study is carried out, the project document (proposal) has to be self sufficient and should clearly indicate that the project:

- Conforms to the national policies and development objectives.
- Is justified by priority needs and problems.
- Is technically, administratively, financially, institutionally, socially and environmentally sound (Magnen, 1991:59; Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 348).

As far as the content is concerned, a project preparation document (proposal) may have different elements. Although the underling concepts can be the same, different organizations/donor agencies use different formats i.e. there are variations in terminology as well as in requirements. For instance, IIEP in Magnen (1991:61) presents the following 6 major components:

1. Justification
2. Objectives
3. Assisted institutions
4. Items to be funded and costs
5. Administration of the project
6. Feasibility

According to Amdeberhan (2004:2-7) a generic project proposal may contain several elements, which are summarized here under:

1. **Title:** The title should be persuasive, positive and one that capture attention.
2. **Cover Letter:** It should be short and look good, quickly gain attention of the reader, convey the importance and urgency of the project etc.
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3. **Executive Summary**: It clearly and concisely summarizes the whole document. It may include title, implementing agency, location, area coverage, beneficiaries, duration, date of commencement, funding agency, project cost etc.

4. **Organization Information/Introduction**: This part of the proposal briefly summarizes the organizations history, mission, client's track record of achievement and other details that build the credibility of the organization.

5. **Background/Project Context**: Here, background information on the project location is given. It could include geographic and climatic information, political and administrative scenario and socio-economic status etc.

6. **Problem Statement and Justification**: Involve stating the problem/need using facts and figures and its justification.

7. **Project Goals and Objectives**: Goal is a broad statement (general/overall/developmental objective) of the ultimate result of the project, where as an objective (immediate objective) is Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bounded (SMART). Good objectives also answer “Wh” questions such as when (time), where (plan of action), who (client), what (expected outcome) and how much (percentage...).

8. **Outputs**: Outputs are the result of project activities intended to achieve the immediate objectives. They are tangible and visible. If an objective is to improve classroom instruction, for example, it can be stated as “At the end of the project 60% of working teachers in Arada Sub-city will be able to apply the new teaching method” and one of the relevant outputs of this objective could be “200 teachers trained etc.”

9. **Activities (activities and timetable)**: are the actions taken to produce the output. For example, possible activities for the above mentioned output might include preparing training materials, selecting trainers, arranging a training center etc. They are often expressed in the form of bar charts. A planning calendar indicating the duration of each of the project activities has to be included.

10. **Inputs**: are the financial, material and human resources necessary for carrying out the activities.
11. Organization and Management: The project’s internal organization (organizational structure) as well as its relations to partner organizations have to be expressed in hierarchical and operational terms and how the project is managed.

12. Monitoring and Evaluation: This part of the project plan, depending on the size of the project, can indicate, what, when and how to monitor and evaluate, who should monitor and evaluate and resource requirements.

13. Phase out Strategy and Sustainability: Here, local institutions or communities who will take over the project have to be identified and indicated. Furthermore, if the project to continue in the future, possible ways that will help to sustain the project should be pointed out.

14. Project Budget: Budgets are cost projections that might show how a project will be implemented and managed. The budget should indicate expected expenses such as personnel, direct project, administrative or overhead expenses etc and earned and/or contribution of income.

15. Project Summary/Logical framework (log frame): Is a matrix that can be completed as part of the design process. According to Bryant and White (1982:118-120) the log frame has the following three advantages. It helps:
   - Designers to reach early agreement about the skeletal framework of the project.
   - To measure achievements at regular intervals during implementation.
   - To beginning the evaluation process.

2.2.3. Managing Project Appraisal

This stage of the project cycle involves a comprehensive and systematic review of the proposed project so as to make proper decision. In other words, the main purpose of the appraisal phase is to assess the overall soundness of the project and its readiness for implementation. Based on the assessment various decisions can be made. The decisions could involve improvement and alternation of some of the plans or even discarding the project (Amdeberhan, 2004:6).
The appraisal of a project is usually made by financing or donor agencies. However, it is also important for those projects generated and financed internally i.e. in the organization. Thus, projects should be carefully reviewed by the appropriate authorities within the operating agency, and perhaps by a separate agency such as a regional education bureau as well and their approval be explicitly granted before funds are committed to the project (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:353).

The process of project appraisal requires a number of criteria that a project must meet to be selected and to have good chances of achieving its objectives. In this regard, Magnen (1991:35-45) points out three major types of criteria for appraising education projects namely priority, feasibility and efficiency criteria. The feasibility criteria include education, technical, socio-political, administrative, institutional and financial feasibilities.

Similarly, other writers like Baum and Tolbert (1985:393-538/585-592), Amdeberhan (2004: 5-6) etc give a detailed explanation on the appraisal process. Accordingly, appraising a project should cover socio-economic and other aspects summarized here with possible questions that can be raised during the process:

1. **Technical aspect**
   - Is the project plan technically sound in general?
   - Is the project design appropriate and will the project work as expected?
   - Are the size, location, timing and choice of the technology package appropriate in relation to the objectives of the project, local conditions such as availability of material, financial and human resources and the intended impact on the beneficiaries?
   - Does the project contribute to the development of local technology and its integration with imported technology, and to the encouragement of local research and innovation?

2. **Economic aspect**
   - Is the project advantageous from the point of view of the economy as a whole?
• Is the project expected to provide a satisfactory return to the economy?
• Is there an alternative way of achieving the same objectives that would offer a higher return?

This aspect might involve cost-benefit analysis. However, all types of project are not amenable to cost-benefit analysis such as evaluating education or health projects (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:586).

3. Financial Aspect
• Are there sufficient funds both to complete the project and to operate and maintain it subsequently?
• Is the finance planned adequately?
• Are the financial aspects of the project beneficial to the different actors and beneficiaries involved in the project?
• To what extent can the beneficiaries or users of the project cover (recover) a portion or portions of the costs?

Nevertheless, many development projects have been launched without adequate consideration of the future availability of funds and this is true for some education projects in which recurrent costs like teachers salaries may quickly exceed the capital costs of the facilities (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:586-87).

4. Social Aspect
  • Is the proposed project suitable and advantageous to the people it is intended to serve?
  • Is the project acceptable to the people directly and/or indirectly affected by it?
  • Does the project consider gender inequalities among the beneficiaries?

Generally Baum and Tolbert (1985:588) list the following four focus areas of social analysis:
  • The socio-cultural and demographic characteristics of the project population
  • The way in which the project population is organized to carry out productive activities
• The project’s cultural acceptability including its capacity both for adapting to
people’s behavior and perceived needs and for bringing about changes in them
• The strategy necessary to elicit commitment from the project population and to
determine their sustained participation throughout the project cycle

5. Institutional Aspect
• Is the organization suitable and capable to implement and manage the project?
• Is the overall policy environment or the legal framework appropriate?
Since the outcome of development projects depends on the quality of the institutions responsible for them, the institutional aspect needs to be given due attention during the appraisal process like that of others.

6. Environmental Aspect
• Does the project have harmful (negative) impact on the environment?
• Can the environment contribute to the outcome of the project through its natural resources?

This aspect mainly focuses on the management of environment whose objective is to achieve a balance between human demands or the nature resource base and the ability of that resource base to meet these demands on a sustainable basis in the interest of future generations as well as those alive today (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:591).

To sum up, if the appraisal process properly addresses the above-mentioned aspects, it helps not only to gain approval but also to modify the project plan in such a way that it achieves its immediate and development objectives.

2.2.4. Managing Project Implementation

Implementation is the most important stage in the project cycle and it covers the actual development of construction of the project up to the point it becomes fully operational. It is the most important because most of the work done in the earlier stages is directed toward ensuring successful implementation of the project. That is to
say, this is the phase where the earlier preparations and designs, plans and analysis are tested in the light of reality.

Some times projects change during implementation due to delays and cost overruns that force a reduction in the scale of the project, changes in design, changes in priorities etc. This shows that unless the project is transformed into action i.e. implemented properly, even a sophisticated project preparation alone may not have value (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:334 and 357).

With regard to time, the implementation phase also takes long period of time as compared with other stages. Magnen (1991:109) explains:

*The implementation of an education project is generally the longest stage of the cycle, during which schools are built or repaired, their equipment installed, teachers trained, innovations introduced, and service, research or administrative institutions established or reformed.*

As cited by Girma (2004:2), project analysts generally divide the implementation stage in to three periods:

- The investment period: when the major project investments are undertaken.
- The development period: when the project’s production builds up.
- The life of the project: when full development is reached.

Regardless of the periods mentioned above, the management of implementation involves various planning and organizational issues including selecting a project unit, recruitment, planning, applying different techniques of management etc.

### 2.2.4.1. Selecting or Establishing the Project Implementation Unit

All projects cannot be implemented by the investment program of a particular agency due to their size and complexity. Some of them require a unique implementation unit to be properly executed. Baum and Tolbert (1985:358) write:

*If individual projects constitute a relatively small proportion of the total investment program, they can routinely be*
implemented as part of it. But if projects are larger or require an integrated effort by several parts of an organization, a special project unit has sometimes been established for the duration of the project.

Further more, a separate project unit that operates under special administrative rules and staffing can be established and/or used for complex projects involving many agencies or for those projects considered of top priority but beyond the line agency.

As one can understand from the above explanation, it is possible to have different types of project organization to manage implementation. In spite of the terminology differences, many writers (Chandra, 2002:604; Harrison, 1981:11-15; Wysocki et al, 2002, 19-25; Cleand and King, 1983:274-280, etc) agree that there are three forms of project organizations, which have their own advantages and disadvantages:

- **Functional organization**: Is the common form of organization.
- **Project (divisional) organization**: Is independent from any major functional units or departments.
- **Matrix organization**: Is a network of intersections between a project team and the functional elements of an organization (a mixed of project and functional structures).

However, project-driven organizations usually use the second form of organizational structure and align their professional staff with projects. In such organizations, a person is assigned to only one project at a time and reassigned to another project when the previous one is completed (Wysocki, 2002:20, Middleton, 1989:68-69).

### 2.2.4.2. Recruiting Project Personnel

Establishing project implementation unit requires competent and capable project manager and other staff. Hence, it is important to recruit the necessary project personnel who effectively and efficiently realize the implementation together with the establishment of the unit (Gulliver, 1989:287). If there is no a separate project
implementation unit i.e. if the project is routinely implemented as the part of the institution’s activity, recruiting project personnel may not be necessary.

Sometimes, recruiting the project personnel is done late i.e. after the start up period is begun. However, this is not advisable for it negatively affects the implementation process. With regard to this, Baum and Tolbert (1985:364) underline: “For best results, the project management and other key staff (senior officials) should be appointed prior to the start of implementation and should participate in its planning.”

Nevertheless, having capable project personnel may not guarantee their commitment and motivation and the intended implementation of the project. There should be good project human resource management so as to motivate and develop the appointed staff (Wysocki, 2002:240; Staw and Rose, 1989:191-192).

2.2.4.3. Planning Implementation

Almost all projects, even those that have simple and clear design are not directly implemented just as the appraisal and approval process is over. Usually, implementation requires further planning and technical arrangements.

This is because the state of the art and the knowledge generally available during preparation and appraisal do not allow a precise definition of the tasks required during implementation and of their sequence (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:360). Dingle (1997:25) also writes: “planning the implementation of the project is, in effect, the keystone in the bridge between the project as a concept and the project as an operating production facility.”

Therefore, to be effective there should be a systematic basis for organizing the activities that independently and/or collectively result in the completion of a project. As Girma (2004:4) point out, for getting started a project implementation we have to provide answers to the following questions about the project:

- What are the goals and objectives of the project?
Who are the principal participants in the project?
- When must the project be started and finished?
- Where will the project be executed?
- How will the product or service be?

Generally, the planning of implementation can involve various activities such as reviewing the technical design, preparing a project framework, estimating work time and project implementation schedule, which are treated hereunder.

I. Reviewing the Technical Design

The technical design of a project has different implications for how the project is implemented. For example, the implementation of a project that uses an advanced and capital intensive technology requires a small number of highly skilled staff and may be relatively simple to organize and structure. In contrast to this, a project using intermediate or labor-intensive technologies requires a larger number of workers and this leads to a more elaborate organization and management. In addition to this, a project design helps to distinguish between projects that can be blue printed (planned/predicted accurately) such as school building construction and those that can not be blue printed i.e. people oriented projects which require a large number of participants to change their behaviour like provision of primary or non formal education (Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 359-360).

Hence, while planning implementation, it is very important to review the design so as to incorporate current experiences and to make useful changes and redesign the project as necessary.

II. Preparing a Project Frame-work

As the name indicates, a project framework i.e. work breakdown structure (WBS) refers to the detailed listing of necessary tasks for completing the project. This is an
important implementation-planning tool particularly for those projects, which already do not have a prepared framework (Girma, 2004:4).

III. Establishing Work Times

After the project framework is made, the next step will be estimating the time that is required to complete each task. Such kind of estimation gives an idea of the level of effort required to complete a project and on which a realistic plan is produced. It also helps to anticipate the budget for the project and serves as the bases for developing a project implementation schedule.

According to Girma (2004:6), estimating the time required for project activities should consider various factors including availability of non labour support, clarity of scope, complexity of the work, financial and legal constraints on the projects, number of personnel assigned to the task, etc.

IV. Estimating project Implementation Schedule

Establishing a schedule, which is a list of things to do usually with times when they should be done, is an important part of implementation planning. It depicts a number of project tasks that have to be undertaken in a particular sequence, with a particular set of interrelations and in an assigned start date and a due date (Moder and Philips, 1970:156, Kemmerer, 1994:62).

According to Baum and Tolbert (1985:362), project implementation schedules are a modified and simpler form of critical path analysis which involves establishing the sequence of activities that minimizes the cost and time of implementation, identifying those activities whose timing is critical to each stage of implementation respectively and taking a necessary step to ensure the tasks get done on time. The schedules are designed to identify at the earliest possible stage the actions required to implement different project components and to specify the sequence, the time required and the agency responsible for the implementation.
A good project implementation schedule, as noted by Girma (2004:7), guides project execution; establishes day-to-day priorities and helps to control progress, make better resource allocation and minimize project cost. Regarding the ways in which schedules are made, there are three commonly known project scheduling techniques namely Milestones Chart, Gant (bar) chart and Network scheduling.

After a satisfactory implementation plan and schedule have been developed, it is necessary to convey the information to those who participate in executing the project and other concerned bodies (UNIDO, 1977:221).

2.2.4.4. Techniques for Managing Implementation

There are various techniques devised to realize the planning and management of implementation. We shall see here some of the common techniques cited by different authorities.

I. Critical Path Analysis

As we have seen above (under establishing project implementation schedule), critical path analysis is characterized by establishing the sequence of activities in such a way that the cost and time of implementation are reduced and then identifying those activities whose timing is critical to each stage of implementation.

The simplest form of critical path analysis used by many project authorities and advocated by some international agencies is the project implementation schedule, which we discussed above briefly. Applying such analysis properly contributes to the effective and efficient implementation management. Conversely, its absence may cause complexity and delay. For instance, those components that have to be implemented earlier can be completed later and this leads to different implementation bottlenecks (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:61-62; Wysocki, 2002:194; Levy and others, 1989:237).
II. Monitoring and Evaluation

Since we will see evaluation as the 5th stage of the project cycle in the next part, here we mainly focus on the ongoing evaluation and its relationship with monitoring.

The general purpose of monitoring and evaluation, as Magnan (1991:117) points out, is systematically to collect and analyze information about the project’s implementation and results and make corrective actions. Many writers in the area define the terms monitoring and evaluation differently. For example, according to Casley and Kumar (1987:2) “monitoring is a continuous assessment both of the functioning of the project activities in the context of implementation schedules and of the use of project inputs by targeted populations in the context of design expectations”, whereas “Evaluation is a periodic assessment of the relevance, performance, efficiency, and impact of the project in the context of its stated objectives”.

Similarly, as explained by HAPCO (2003:7), monitoring refers to the routine tracking of the project’s ongoing activities, achievements and constraints. It helps to ensure that activities are carried out as planned. It answers the question: What are we doing? However, evaluation refers to the assessment of program/project implementation and its success in obtaining predetermined objectives. It answers the questions: What have we achieved and how? What we have not achieved and why?

As one can learn from the definitions given above, even though monitoring and evaluations are two separate managerial activities, they have a complementary function in development programs/projects. USAID (in Girma 2004:2-3) summarizes the difference between and complementary features of monitoring and evaluation using tables:
Table 4: Major Differences Between Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To determine the efficiency and legitimacy of the application and use of inputs as well as their conversion into outputs</td>
<td>• To determine whether the objectives set were realistic, given the capacities with which and the circumstances in which they had to be fulfilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To facilitate an adjustment of activity plans, time schedules or budgets</td>
<td>• To undertake review of things done i.e. to assess the impact of the project activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference period/ Frequency</td>
<td>✓ It takes place during the execution of a program/project activity</td>
<td>✓ Carried out periodically i.e. before the implementation of the program/project and on different periods while the planned activities are on progress as well as after it become operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ It is a continuous feedback system that remains in force throughout the program/project implementation stage.</td>
<td>✓ Focuses on effectiveness, relevance or impact and cost-effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Focuses on inputs, process, output and work plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Users</td>
<td>✓ It is a tool for project managers to use in judging and influencing the progress of implementation</td>
<td>✓ Results are used by funding agencies and other relevant institutions in future programs/projects design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Gathered</td>
<td>✓ Primarily quantitative</td>
<td>✓ Primarily qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USAID/Ethiopia, Performance Monitoring Workshop Handout, March 1997

However, both monitoring and evaluation use the same data collection and analysis system. Furthermore, the indicators for monitoring may be included in the range of information required for evaluation, but they will be reviewed over a longer span, with the use of comparative analytical techniques.
**Table 5: Complementary Features of Monitoring and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Implementation oriented</td>
<td>✓ Policy oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Tracks results</td>
<td>✓ Explain results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Assesses intermediate results</td>
<td>✓ Assesses attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Focuses on timeliness</td>
<td>✓ Focuses in rigour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Emphasis on multi-level results</td>
<td>✓ Emphasis on final results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Informs Budgeting</td>
<td>✓ Informs broad resources allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Strengthen accountability for managing results</td>
<td>✓ Strengthens accountability for results themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Essential for program implementation and improvements</td>
<td>✓ Essential for strategy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Can use disaggregated data</td>
<td>✓ May need aggregated data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Source: USAID/Ethiopia, Performance Monitoring Workshop Handout, March 1997_

In spite of their differences and complementary nature, both monitoring and evaluation are normal functions of project management that make contribution to successful management of development projects. Concerning organization, it is widely believed that establishing a monitoring and evaluation unit with in the project is very useful.

→ In order to have a successful monitoring and evaluation system, Baum and Tolbert (1985:363) suggest the following prerequisites:

- Managers have to want the system and be committed to its use.
- Decision on the data to be collected should be based on the problems that will need to be solved during implementation.
- Requirements for data collection have to be adapted to realistic standards of accuracy, time lines, and cost.
- The system has to be designed at an early stage of project preparation and baseline data collected well in advance.
III. Management Information System

It is not a secret that lack of reliable information can cause different problems and failures during project implementation. In the absence of appropriate information, Magnen (1999:117) comments, “project managers can neither detect improper functioning, nor of course take early decisions to remedy them. Decision makers can neither analyze the causes of problems, nor choose more appropriate objectives and implementation strategies on the basis of good understanding”.

Therefore, to be effectively and efficiently managed, project implementation requires adequate management information system. Such a system is expected to include the basic physical and financial records, the details of inputs and services provided to beneficiaries and the data obtained from surveys and other recording mechanisms. In other words, the project management personnel at various levels of the project hierarchy should get timely and relevant information so as to undertake the different tasks assigned to them (Casley and Kumar, 1987:2-3; Gaddis, 1989:155-156; Harpool et al, 1987:4-5).

However, it is vital to understand that the same information system can not be useful in the implementation of two or more projects i.e. different types of projects need different information systems. For example, people oriented projects that include the provision of services by many agents in geographically scattered areas need an information system sensitive to the local conditions and to the local level record keeping (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:364).

That is why it is necessary to have a sufficient and relevant information system that can go with the nature, size and location of the project under implementation.

2.2.5. Managing Project Evaluation

The last but not the list stage of the project cycle is evaluation (not the ongoing one), which takes place after a project has passed through the implementation stage and has entered in to operation.
We have seen that evaluation is generally used for the improvement and development of projects and programs. In this part of the review, we focus only on the types of evaluation as well as some of its procedures to be conducted.

### 2.2.5.1. Types of Evaluation

As far as periods of evaluation are concerned, various writers use different kinds of classifications and/or terminologies. Magnen (1991:118) and Nevo (1985: xv), for example, cited two types namely:

1. **Formative or proactive evaluation** (evaluation during implementation/ongoing) and
2. **Summative/retrospective/retroactive evaluation** (after completion of the project)


**i. Ex-ante Evaluation:** This type of evaluation is carried out before the implementation of the project activity and can be seen as a “base line” study in which the situation of the project area, the target group and its environment is described.

**ii. Mid-term /ongoing/ “built in” Evaluation:** This type of evaluation takes place while the implementation of the planned project is on progress. Unlike other types of evaluation, it helps to make correction on some mistakes of the implementation process.

**iii. Terminal Evaluation:** Is known as a project completion report and it is conducted when the funding for the project comes to an end.

**iv. Ex-post Evaluation (Impact Evaluation):** It is undertaken some time (in most cases 5-10 years) after the program/project activity has been terminated in order to determine its impact on the target group and the local area.

With regard to the people and/or the institutions that conduct evaluation, we can have the following two different types (Nevo, 1985: xvii; Girma: 2004:26):
1. **Internal Evaluation**: This is performed by implementing institutions themselves i.e. persons who have a direct role in the program/project (usually employed evaluators). On-going or midterm evaluation can be done by the management team or persons assigned from the implementing agency.

2. **External Evaluation**: This is carried out by institutions i.e. persons from outside the project. Terminal and ex-post evaluations are often conducted by the funding agencies.

In addition to these, Scrievel (in Nevo, 1985: xviii) distinguish between evaluations made by professional evaluators and those performed by amateur evaluators.

### 2.2.5.2. Steps and Procedures

The process of doing an evaluation involves different steps and procedures. However, the steps and procedures may differ according to the nature of the project and the type of evaluation itself. That is why different authorities recommend different evaluation procedures.

Perceiving evaluation as an activity intended to determine whether goals have been achieved, Tyler (in Nevo, 1985: xvii) suggests that the evaluation process includes:

- Stating goals in behavioral terms
- Developing measurement instruments
- Collecting data
- Interpreting findings
- Making recommendations

According to Girma (2004:27-29) the general framework for evaluation particularly impact assessment involves the following steps:

**Stage 1. Establishing the activities being evaluated/analyzed**: This includes the objective, beneficiaries, intended inputs etc of the project as well as the implementation plan

**Stage 2. Analysis of implementation**: Here evaluators collect the necessary data and consider what actually happened to the project and any problem that arose.
Stage 3. Assessing project achievements: At this stage, what the project actually achieved is compared with its original objectives.

Stage 4. Conclusion and recommendation: At this stage, findings are brought together and conclusions and recommendations are drawn based on the findings.

To this end, since the aim of evaluation is to facilitate the progress of implementation; assess the performance of projects with respect to the fulfillment of their intended objectives; and to learn important lessons for the development of future projects, it is necessary to give due attention to this important project management tool.

2.3. Major Problems of Project Management

As evidences show, a number of projects, particularly in developing countries, have not been completed on time, at or relatively and reasonably close to the original cost estimates, and with the expected benefit realized... due to various problems or factors (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:366).

In this part of the review, therefore, it is tried to show different problems or factors that lead to the unsuccessful development projects in general and educational projects in particular.

2.3.1. Problems Associated with Project Identification, Preparation and Appraisal

It is said that the main purpose of a large part of identification and preparation work is to reduce project management problems. So, a poor identification and preparation work cause various pitfalls that adversely affect the management and generally the success of the project.

As different writers (Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 368-369, Magnen, 1991: 109-110; Anderson et al 1997:131-140, and Rondinelli, 1977:12) note, problems associated with the first three stages of the project cycle can include the following:
- **Poor project screening and prioritization:** unless the project idea is well defined, screened and prioritized based on relevant ranking criteria at the beginning, the project will face difficulties to be managed in later stages.

- **Complex Design:** If the general design of a project is too complex, its management will be difficult. Thus, as much as possible, it is important to develop a simple project design, which is central to successful project management.

- **Poorly defined objectives:** If the objectives (both developmental and immediate) of a project are not clearly set out, not based on proven and appropriate technologies or approaches, and inconsistent with the national education policy etc, they will not have chance to be managed successfully.

- **Insufficient preparation:** Although the extent of a feasible preparation depends on the type of project, certain/necessary actions should always be made during preparation. If they are ignored or given little attention, however, the likelihood of management difficulties mounts.

Regarding this, Baum and Tolbert (1985:369) present the following illustration:

> The preparation of an education project is sometimes considered to be completed when the sites of some of the schools have been selected and a preliminary design for them prepared. During implementation, there may be difficulties in acquiring sites, problems with soil foundations, or large increases in cost because of changes in design. A clear plan for land acquisition and detailed engineering studies would reduce or eliminate such problems.

In sufficient preparation also includes different pitfalls such as less or no attention to local conditions, over and/or under estimation of time and cost, omission of activities etc (Anderson et al, 1997:35-36) and these mistakes can be corrected by careful preparation.

- **Poor Appraisal:** The poorly appraised project may not be managed easily during implementation.
Therefore, the plan should be assessed and appraised whether it has socio-economic development benefit and is technically feasible and manageable.

2.3.2. Problems Associated with Implementation and Evaluation

2.3.2.1. Implementation problems

As noted earlier, adequate preparation and appraisal work minimizes implementation problems but it may not avoid all of them. Consequently, projects, which are inadequately managed during implementation, continue to fail or expensively delayed. Some of the problems encountered while implementation of a project takes place are the following:

➢ **Irrelevant selection of the implementation unit:** For some projects matrix structure is appropriate, where as others can be managed well through functional or project organization (Anderson et al, 1997:41-42). Thus, unless the appropriate implementation unit is selected based on the nature of the project, managing implementation will be difficult.

➢ **Delays:** Baum and Tolbert (1985:364-5) point out three general delays that have negative impact on the implementation of a project:

   ▪ Delays in selecting and appointing project personnel, particularly the project manager and other senior officials.

   ▪ Delays in budgetary allocations and in establishing the legislative or administrative channels for the flow of funds. As a result, the implementation agency faces shortage of resources to begin project implementation at the right time.

   ▪ Delays in completing legal or administrative arrangements, especially, in projects in which more than one implementing agency are involved.

Further more, Anderson et al (1997:40) list down and explain other implementation problems such as:

   ▪ Poor implementation plan,
• Poor project communication,
• Shortage of key resources due to various reasons,
• Low motivation and commitment of project personnel etc.

2.3.2.2. Problems of Monitoring and Evaluation

There are several limiting factors for successful management of monitoring and evaluation of development projects. Based on the experiences in Ethiopia, Girma (2004:30-31) lists down the following problems as the most common ones:

➢ Insufficient awareness of the purpose of monitoring and evaluation and inadequate attention to project implementation. Monitoring and evaluation activities are not seen as distinct responsibility on its own and not given proper consideration. People rather feel monitoring and evaluation as a faultfinding mission and limit their cooperation for the activity.

➢ Inadequate or lack of monitoring and evaluation unit and staff both at the project level and higher implementing body. In most cases monitoring and evaluation system is not either properly established or not provided adequate attention and resources where it exists.

➢ Poor accountability for failures and inadequate reward for special efforts made on the successful project implementation.

➢ Limited training opportunity for monitoring and evaluation personnel in projects or offices where the unit exists.

➢ Limited information source on project progress. Even when information is available it doesn’t answer the right questions. Frequently, where the system exists, it focuses only on quantitative financial aspects and physical implementation of the program/project.

➢ Late arrival of information required for monitoring.

➢ Too costly to collect information.

➢ Disregard of previous monitoring and evaluation findings in the design of new projects.
High mobility of project staff disrupting continuity of monitoring and evaluation functions.

2.3.3. General Project Management Problems

Based on some literature, we can describe the general problems of project management under five categories namely financial, institutional, technical, and political and participation problems:

2.3.3.1. Financial Problems

Even though the causes may be diversified, financial difficulties are common in many development projects. For some projects, for instance, inadequate allocation of budgetary funds, delayed release of funds, inflation, increase in price (higher costs) etc are the most common problems.

Cost overruns which are both a cause and an effect of financial difficulties can also occur because of inadequate management, insufficient project preparation, deficient technical design, political interference, and procurement problems i.e. these all can result in higher than expected costs (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:373; Wynant, 1989:210-211; Gibbs et al: 1999:20).

2.3.3.2. Institutional Problems

It is believed that better institutional capacity and good management are major determinants of project success. If the institutional capacity of the implementing agency is law and if the institution has project personnel who lack managerial talent and skill, the implementation of the project may not be realized as desired and planned.

According to Baum and Tolbert (1985:373) institutional problems include:

A dearth of people with specific skills (accountants, technicians) and with general administrative capabilities; inadequate management, accounting, and reporting systems and procedures;
an ill-defined organizational setup; low salaries and poor staffing policies; and lack of coordination among agencies.

Hence, improving institutional capacity, hiring capable and competent project manager and other personnel, motivating them continuously, having good staffing policies coordination etc play a vital role in mitigating the institutional problems of project management.

2.2.3.3. Technical Problems

Various technical problems can arise during the process of managing projects. In people oriented activities (projects) such as education, the lack of approaches fully tested for the particular circumstances of the project area is one of the technical problems. Many problems also occurred in constructing civil works and in procuring or operating equipment. These include difficult or unexpected soil conditions, poor quality of materials, technical defects in design, mistakes in the installation and start-up of equipment, unsuitability of imported equipment for local conditions or otherwise inappropriate technology (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:374; Havelock and Huberman, 1977:109; Hallak, 1990:208-209).

So, it is necessary to pay due attention to better project preparation work and design insofar and finding possible alternatives when such problems are faced.

2.3.3.4. Political Problems

According to Ahmed (1977:165) and Baum and Tolbert (1985:366 and 375), one of the most important reasons for the success of a project is strong and sustainable commitment by the government to the project’s objectives. When such commitment is absent, weak or variable, it is obvious that project implementation suffers. Even in the absence of natural and man made disasters like famine, war etc. political problems are at the center of several difficulties experienced by projects.

Therefore, project management has to take the potential impact of political and administrative factors into account. That is to say, project owners and managers
should involve concerned local and regional political leaders in different stages of the project cycle; anticipate such problems in so far as possible and modify the implementation process accordingly.

2.3.3.5. Participation Problems

The proper involvement of concerned community members i.e. direct and indirect beneficiaries, local and regional political leaders and other stakeholders in all stages of the project cycle reduces the complexity of project management. Because, it promotes commitment, sense of ownership and responsibility of the participants towards the project. It also helps to ensure that the purpose of the project has the understanding and support of the community members on whom successful implementation will depend. Generally, it strongly assists the project to be acceptable and sustainable.

Nevertheless, ignoring the importance of participation i.e. low or no involvement of concerned people in project activities due to various reasons like time and cost constraints, “we know better than others” fallacy... can lead to low acceptance or resistance, sustainability problems, difficulties in mobilizing local resources etc (World Bank, 1996: 232-233; Oakley et al, 1991:14-18; Girma, 2004: 7-8 and CRDA, 2005:15-18).
CHAPTER THREE
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data collected from three groups of respondents through questionnaires and interviews.

The respondents to the two different questionnaires were key project personnel i.e. project managers/administrators, project/program coordinators, project officers, monitoring and evaluation experts etc. and direct beneficiaries of the education projects undertaken by the NGOs under this study. Assuming that each of the 20 responding organizations has at least 6 concerned personnel involved in the management of the projects, out of a total of 120 project personnel, all (100%) of them were included in the sample. Similarly, 120 direct beneficiaries of the projects were selected to fill in the questionnaire developed for them. However, out of 120 copies of the questionnaire distributed among project personnel only 110 (92%) and out of 120 copies of the questionnaire given to direct beneficiaries only 114 (95%) copies were filled, returned and used for analysis.

In addition to the questionnaires, unstructured interview was conducted with two concerned experts from Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau and other two officials from Addis Ababa Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGO’s Affairs team. Hence, the data gathered through the interview were also used for analysis.
### 3.1. General characteristics of the Respondents

**Table 6: Sex, Age and Educational Level of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) ≤15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 16-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) 26-35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) 36-45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) 46-55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) ≥56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Illiterate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Literate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Primary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Secondary/Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Diploma</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) First degree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Second and/or third degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 depicts sex, age and educational level of the two groups of respondents. With regard to sex, majority (66 %) of the project personnel were male, whereas only 37 (34 %) of them were female. Similarly, 71 (62 %) of the direct beneficiaries were male, while 43 (38 %) of them were female. From this data, one can understand that the attention given to the gender balance seems little i.e. the responding NGOs had high number of male project personnel as well as male beneficiaries than females.

As shown in item two of the table, the age of project personnel ranged from 16 to 56, whereas the age of the beneficiaries ranged from ≤ 15 to 55. Accordingly, 43 (39 %) of the project personnel were from 26 to 35 years old, whereas 37 (34 %) of them belonged to the age group of 36 to 45. Twenty-one (19%) of the respondents were 46 to 55 years old, while the remaining 6 (5 %) and other three belonged to the 16 to 25 and ≥56 age group respectively. On the other hand, 52 (46 %) of the beneficiaries were 16 to 25 years old, whereas 47 (41 %) of them were 26 to 35 years old and few (9 %) of them belonged to the age group of 36 to 45. This indicates that, as far as age is concerned, almost all of the respondents were in a position to respond to the questions and give appropriate answers that enable to attain the purpose of the study.

As far as educational level is concerned, more than half (56 %) of the project personnel were first-degree holders, while 37 (34 %) of them had diploma. Few (5 %) of them had second and/or third degree and the rest 6 (5 %) had only certificates. This implies that the majority (56 + 5 = 61%) of the project personnel seem to have adequate qualifications to manage the education projects under study.

Meanwhile, majority (68 %) and almost one third (32 %) of the beneficiaries attended primary and secondary education respectively; whereas 6 (5 %) of them were literate i.e. able to read and write and the rest (3 %) of them were illiterate. Since most of them were literate, it is possible to understand that they were in a position to fill in the questionnaire distributed among them and contribute to the study by providing the necessary information.
### Table 7: Current Position, Work Experience and Training of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Current position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Project manager</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Project/program coordinator</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Project officer</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Monitoring and evaluation expert</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work experience in the area of development project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) ≤ 1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 2 - 4 years</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) 5 - 7 years</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) 8 - 10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) ≥11 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training on development project management in general and/or educational project management in particular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Get training</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Do not get training</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 portrays the current position, relevant work experience and training of the respondents (project personnel). In terms of post, 43 (39%) of them were project (program) coordinators and 34 (30%) of them were project officers, whereas just one-fourth (25%) of them were project managers. The rest (6%) of them were monitoring and evaluation experts, administrators and executive directors. Since the respondents were key project personnel involved in the management of the projects, the data collected from them meaning their opinions can be trustworthy.

With regard to work experience, 43 (39%) of the respondents had 2 to 4 years of work experience in the area of development project management, followed by 31 (28%) project personnel who had 5 to 7 years work experience. However, 15 (14%) of them had only one year and less work experience, whereas 9 (8%) of them had 11 and more years of work experience in the area of development project management. From this, it is not difficult to infer that majority of the respondents had relatively adequate work experience to tell about the problems of the education projects managed by the NGOs under study.

To the question “Have you ever got training on development project management in general and/or educational project management in particular?”, majority (68%) of the respondents reported that they did not get training on development project management in general and/or educational project management in particular, whereas the rest (38%) said that they were trained.

As effective and efficient project management requires relevant training, it is not difficult to understand that a significant number of the respondents might lack the technical knowledge that can be acquired from such training and this leads to poor project management. This is because if an organization has project personnel who lack managerial talent and skill, the implementation of the project may not be realized as desired and planned (Baum and Tolbert (1985:373).
3.2. Analysis of Data

3.2.1. Project Identification and Preparation

Table 8: Sources and Selection of Project Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Origination of project idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Organization itself</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Donor agency</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Was the idea of this project described, screened and prioritized based on some criteria among other project ideas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Described, screened and prioritized</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not described, screened and prioritized</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Do not know</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the sources and selection of project ideas. As indicated in Item 1 of the table, the respondents were asked to tell the bodies that originally identified or generated the project ideas. Accordingly, about three-fourth (73%) of the project personnel replied that the project ideas were generated by the implementing organizations themselves, whereas 24 (22%) of them reported the project ideas were identified and initiated by donor agencies (donor driven). The remaining (5%) cited other organizations and individuals as generators of the project ideas.

With regard to describing, screening and prioritizing of project ideas (item 2), more than half (53%) of the project personnel responded that the ideas of the education projects were not described, screened and prioritized before moving to the next stage, while 21 (19%) of them reported the reverse. Meanwhile, 31 (28%) of the respondents
told that they did not know whether the ideas were described, screened and prioritized.

This implies that more than half (53%) of the projects might not be relatively best, if they would be described, screened and prioritized based on relevant criteria and this contributes to difficult implementation process. The reason is that unless a project idea is well defined, screened and prioritized based on relevant ranking criteria at the beginning, the project will face difficulties to be managed in later stages (Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 368-369, Maguen, 1991: 109-110; Anderson et al 1997:131-140, and Rondinelli, 1977:12). Further more, the answer given by the 31 project personnel may indicate that they did not participate in the identification stage of the projects cycle.

Table 9: Objectives of the Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarity of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Extremely clear</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Very clear</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Somewhat clear</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Not clear</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objectives of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Adhere to the current education policy</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not adhere to the current education policy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Do not know</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Objectives of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Modified during different phases of the project</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not modified during different phases</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Do not know</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows the nature of the project objectives. Concerning the clarity and vividness of the projects' objectives (item 1), 76 (69%) of the respondents reported objectives of the projects were very clear, followed by 22 (20%) project personnel who said they were somewhat clear, whereas others (11%) responded they were extremely clear.

As indicated in item 2 of the table, most (86%) of the respondents believed that objectives of the projects closely adhered to the current education policy of the country, while 15 (14%) of them said they did not know whether the objectives were consistent with the education policy. This implies that few of the project personnel might not be familiar with the existing education policy.

Since majority of the projects' objectives were clear and consistent with the education policy, it is safe to generalize that they will have a better chance to be attained. This is because if the objectives of a project are clearly set out, and consistent with the national education policy, they will have chance to be managed successfully (Magnen, 1991: 109-110 and Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 368-369).

In addition to items 1 and 2, the respondents were asked to write objectives of the projects and it was found that almost all of the objectives were in line with the policy. However, most of them were not as such technically sound (specific, measurable, achievable, reliable and time bound/SMART) i.e. they were stated just like outputs. This leads one to infer that the immediate objectives are not as such easy to be measured so that corrective actions are taken (Amdeberhan, 2004:4).

To the question "Were objectives of the project modified during different phases of the project?", majority (64%) of the project personnel answered "no", whereas 24 (22%) of them responded "yes". The remaining 16 (14%) personnel reported they did not know if modification (revision) of the projects was made.

This might lead to the assumption that either the nature of majority of the projects' objectives was not complex (did not require to be revised again and again) or the organizations were reluctant/unwilling to make continuous revisions.
Table 10; Project Proposal and Its Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-sufficiency and design of the project proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Self-sufficient and well designed</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not self-sufficient and well designed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Do not know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Content of the project proposal include: *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Background and justification of the project</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Objectives and beneficiaries of the project</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Outputs, activities and inputs of the project</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Organization and management and budget of the project</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To improve the project plan or proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Major revisions made frequently</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Major revisions made once or twice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Only minor revision was made</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No revision was made</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General design of the project was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Simple and clear</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not simple and clear</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Responses

Table 10 deals with the degree of self-sufficiency and simplicity of the project proposals. As depicted in item one of the above table, most (95%) of the respondents reported that the project proposals were self sufficient and well designed before
submission, whereas the remaining 6 (5 %) said that they did not know whether the project proposals were self-sufficient and well designed or not. In view of the responses given, one can understand that the project proposals were not as such complex and difficult to be appraised by the education bureau.

Regarding the contents of the project proposals, all (100 %) of the responding project personnel said that contents of the project proposals consisted of background, justification, objectives and beneficiaries of the projects. Moreover most (93 %) of them further added that contents of the project proposals comprised outputs, activities, inputs, organization and management and budget of the projects.

This implies that most of the project proposals seem self-sufficient i.e. they contained important components of a relatively good project proposal which might facilitate the implementation of the project (Amdeberhan, 2004:2).

As indicated in item 3 of the above table, 72 (66 %) of the respondents reported that only minor revision was made to improve the project plans (proposals), whereas 32 (29 %) of them told that the project proposals were not ever modified. However, minority (5 %) of them said that major revisions were made once or twice.

Regarding the design of the projects, all (100 %) of the respondents answered that the general design of the projects was simple and clear. This entails that the general design of the projects might have a positive contribution to their implementation. This is because the simplicity and clarity of a project design can simplify the execution of the project (Baum and Tolbert, 1985: 368-369).

The data gathered through interview, which was conducted with concerned experts (officials) from Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau and Addis Ababa Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGO’s Affairs team, also indicate that except some technical limitations, the over all designs of the projects were not complex.
### 3.2.2. Project Appraisal and Implementation

#### Table 11; Process, Criteria and Results of Project Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Before submission to donor agencies and/or the education bureau, the project proposal was:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Appraised</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not appraised</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If appraised, the appraisal was made by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Project manager</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Project coordinator</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Project officer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) The whole staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appraisal criteria used by the Education Bureau were:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Relevant and adequate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not relevant and adequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Do not know</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The education bureau had:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Qualified project personnel/appraisers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not qualified project personnel/appraisers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Do not know</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Results of the appraisal made by the education bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Helped to improve the project proposal</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not helped to improve the project proposal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) No Answer was given</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 presents the process, criteria and results of project appraisal. As shown in item 1 of the table, the respondents were asked whether they appraised the project proposals before submitting to donor agencies and/or the education bureau via the civil and social affairs office. Hence, more than three-fourth (78 %) of them chose “yes” i.e. they said that the project proposals were appraised before submission, while 24 (22 %) of them reported the reverse.

In item 2 of the same table, those respondents who answered “yes” for the above question were further asked to tell the people who appraised the project proposals within the institutions. Accordingly, 31 (36 %), 22 (26 %) and 15 (17 %) of the respondents reported that the project proposals were appraised by project coordinators, project managers and the whole project staff respectively, whereas 12 (14 %) of them cited other concerned bodies such as executive directors, board of directors and country representatives. The remaining 6 (5 %) of them said that project officers were in charge of appraising the proposals within the institutions.

This shows that majority of the projects’ proposals had a chance to be improved before being submitted to donor agencies and/or the education bureau for careful review by the appropriate authorities within the operating agency helps a project to be selected and to have good chances of achieving its objectives (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:353).

With regard to the appraisal criteria (item 3), majority (64 %) of the project personnel responded that the appraisal criteria used by the Addis Ababa Education Bureau were relevant and adequate to appraise the project proposals, while 33 (30 %) of them stated that they did not know the criteria employed to appraise the proposals. Nonetheless, few (6 %) of them replied that the criteria were not relevant and adequate. The answer given by the majority might imply that the criteria were helpful to appraise and improve project proposals.
According to the data collected through interview, the education bureau did not approve a project unless its objectives go with the education policy and this was considered as the most important criterion of project appraisal in the bureau.

In item 4 of the table, the respondents were asked whether the education bureau had adequate and qualified project appraisers. Although 47 (43 %) of them answered “yes”, a significant number (34 %) of the respondents said that they knew nothing and the rest (23 %) responded that they did not think the education bureau had adequate and qualified personnel who appraise education projects properly.

As the results of the interview made with concerned officials of the Education Bureau indicate, although the bureau had qualified and experienced personnel who could appraise education projects properly, they were not adequate in terms of number. To reduce this problem (shortage of appraisers), the existing plan and project experts used to involve other concerned personnel of the bureau in the appraisal process. For example, if the project plan focuses on adult education, the expert from adult education department will be involved in the appraisal of the project.

To the question “Did the results of the appraisal made by the education bureau help you to improve the project proposal?”, more than half (55 %) of the project personnel answered “yes”, whereas about one-third (34 %) of them responded “no”. The remaining 12 (11 %) personnel did not give answer.
Table 12: Elements of Project Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>After the appraisal, implementation was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Started only based on the appraised project plan</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not started</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For this project, a project-implementing unit was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Established</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not established</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Key project personnel were:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Recruited after implementation started</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not recruited after implementation started</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Information system in the project (project communication) is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Very good</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Somewhat good</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Not good</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The general organizational situation has:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Motivated project personnel and increased their commitment</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not motivated project personnel and increased their commitment</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attrition rate among project personnel is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) High</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Medium</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Low</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) No attrition at all</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 portrays some important elements of project implementation including project implementing unit, recruitment and motivation of key project personnel and the information system in the project (project communication).

As indicated in item 1 of the table, majority (61%) of the respondents replied that they immediately started to implement the projects only based on the appraised project plan (proposal) just after the appraisal was over, whereas 43 (39%) of them responded that they did not start implementation as soon as the appraisal was over.

Those who answered “no” were further asked what they did after the appraisal and they gave diversified answers. While most of them stated that they prepared implementation plans, some of them confirmed that implementation of the projects was started before the education bureau appraised the project proposals.

This implies that majority of the responding NGOs commenced to implement the projects without preparing any implementation plan and this might adversely affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation in particular and the overall project management in general. This is because planning implementation of a project is the keystone to bridge between the project as a concept and the project as an operating production facility (Dingle, 1997:25).

With respect to the project-implementing unit (item 2), nearly three-fourth (74%) of the project personnel responded that their organizations established project-implementing units for the projects, whereas one-fourth (26%) of them reported that their organizations did not establish project-implementing units to undertake the projects. This may not be difficult to understand that those organizations, which did not establish a separate project-implementing unit, were undertaking the projects by using the existing structures.

To the question “Were the key project personnel recruited after the implementation of the project started?”, most (81%) of the respondents answered “yes”, while 21 (19%)
of them said “no”. The responses show that most of the NGOs recruited and appointed project personnel after the implementation was begun due to various reasons such as delayed release of fund and this might negatively affect the implementation process for they did not have chance to participate in its planning and have detailed understanding of the projects.

Concerning the information system (project communication), Nearly two-third (64 %) of the project personnel replied that the information system in the projects was somewhat good, followed by 34 (31 %) respondents who said it was very good. The rest 6 (5 %), however, reported that it was not good. This implies that the attention given to the information system, which helps to detect improper functioning and take early decisions to remedy them, seems little and this might cause different problems and failures during implementation.

To the question “Do you think that the general organizational situation has motivated project personnel and increased their commitment to the project?”, nearly three-forth (73 %) of the respondents answered “no”, while 30 (27%) of them said “yes”.

As far as the attrition rate is concerned, 52 (47 %) of the respondents reported that the attrition rate among project personnel was high, followed by 39 (35 %) of them who said it was low, whereas 16 (15 %) of them replied that it was medium. The rest (3 %) responded that there was no attrition among project personnel.

As we can understand from the responses given in items 6 and 7, majority of the responding NGOs might not have conducive work environment that motivates project personnel and increases their commitment to the projects and this might lead to the poor management of the projects. The reason why the NGOs had such kind of work environment might be related to their overall institutional capacity.
### 3.2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation

#### Table 13; The Situation of Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attention given to Monitoring and Evaluation is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Very high</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Little</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Not attention is given</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The organization has:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Separate Monitoring and Evaluation Unit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not separate Monitoring and Evaluation Unit</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If the organization has a separate unit, the unit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Has adequate and qualified personnel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Does not have adequate &amp; qualified personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 presents the practice/situation of monitoring and evaluation in the responding NGOs. According to the first item of the table, about three-fourth (66%) of the respondents reported that their organizations gave little attention to monitoring and evaluation (M&E), whereas 22 (20%) of them stated that no attention was given to monitoring and evaluation in their organization. Nevertheless, 10 (9%)
respondents and the rest 5 (4 %) replied that the attention given to M&E in their respective organizations were high and very high respectively.

This shows that majority of the NGOs might face difficulties to make corrective actions as they gave little or no attention to monitoring and evaluation, which are concerned with collecting and analyzing information about the projects’ implementation, results etc and making corrective actions. The reason why they gave little or no attention to monitoring and evaluation might be insufficient awareness of the purpose of M&E, inadequate or lack of fund, limited training opportunity and so on (Girma, 2004: 30-31).

As presented in item 2 of the above table, the project personnel were asked whether their organizations had a separate M&E unit. Except 12 (11 %) respondents who answered “yes”, most (89 %) of them told that their organizations did not have a separate unit for M&E and the key project personnel i.e. project managers, coordinators or officers etc themselves were engaged in monitoring and evaluating the projects.

As indicated in item 3 of the same table, those respondents whose organizations had a separate M&E unit were further asked whether the units had adequate and qualified M&E personnel and 8 (67 %) of them answered “yes”, while 4 (33 %) of them responded “no”.

This can lead one to conclude that a significant number of the NGOs, which had separate M&E units, had no adequate and qualified Monitoring and Evaluation personnel due to their institutional capacity and other related reasons.
Table 14; Types of Evaluation and Utilization of M&E Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Evaluated</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not evaluated</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If yes, who did evaluate the project? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) The organization itself (by its own staff)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The organization itself through external experts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) The donor agency</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) The Education bureau</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The type of evaluation made was: *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Ex-anti (before implementation)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Midterm/ongoing (during implementation)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Terminal (at the end of the project)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Ex-post (sometime after the project was closed down)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Feedbacks gained through monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Utilized for improvement</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not utilized for improvement</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Responses

Table 14 depicts evaluating bodies, types of evaluation and utilization of M&E results. To the question “Was the project ever evaluated?”, majority (69 %) of the project personnel checked “yes”, whereas 34 (31 %) of them answered “no”.

In items 2 and 3 of the table, those respondents who said “yes” were asked to tell the responsible body that evaluated the projects and the type of evaluation made. Therefore, 37 (49 %) of the respondents said that the projects were evaluated by the
organization itself (by its own staff), while 25 (33 %), 24 (32 %) and 20 (26 %) of them reported that the projects were evaluated by the organizations themselves through external experts, donor agencies and the Education bureau respectively.

In terms of the types of evaluation, more than half (58 %) of the respondents replied that the evaluation made was midterm/ongoing (during implementation), followed by 31 (28 %) and 19 (17 %) project personnel who reported that terminal (at the end of the project) and ex-anti (before implementation) evaluations were employed respectively. The remaining 6 (5 %) said that ex-post (sometime after the project was closed down) evaluation was conducted in their organizations.

The interview results also show that the education bureau and the social and NGOs' affairs team were only involved in terminal evaluations due to shortage of experts and this is against the agreement that oblige them to periodically monitor and evaluate the operations (the over all progresses) of the projects.

As presented in item 4 of the table, the respondents were asked whether the organizations properly utilized the feedbacks gained through monitoring and evaluation and made some improvements. Majority (66 %) of them responded that the organizations did not properly utilize the feedbacks and made some improvements.

As we can understand from the responses given, though most of the NGOs used to monitor and evaluate their projects, majority (66 %) of them did not properly utilize the feedbacks and make corrective actions, which help to achieve desired objectives of the projects. This practice greatly reduces the value of monitoring and evaluation (Baum and Tolbert, 1985:363).
3.2.4. Relationship with the Education Bureau and Participation

Table 15; Reporting, Feedback and Technical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your organization</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Sends reports to the education bureau</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Does not send</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It reports: *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Bi-annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Based on reports, the education bureau</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Gives feedback</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Does not give</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The feedback is:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Extremely useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Very useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Somewhat useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Not useful</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The education bureau</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Provides technical assistance</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Does not provide</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The organization generally manage the project</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) According to agreement with the education bureau</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not according to agreement</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Responses

Table 15 deals with the reporting system and feedbacks and technical assistances given by the education bureau. As far as reporting is concerned, majority (81 %) of the respondents suggested that their organizations sent reports to the education bureau.
according to the agreement. Nevertheless, 21 (19%) of them disclosed that their organizations did not send reports to the education bureau.

Item 2 of the table presents the reporting period used by those organizations, which sent reports to the education bureau. Hence, all (100%) of the respondents said that they sent reports quarterly, whereas 13 (15%) of them replied that they also sent annual reports to the bureau.

To the question “Does the education bureau give feedback based on your report?”, most (81%) of the project personnel answered “no”. However, 8 (9%) of them said “yes”. As shown in item 4 of the table, among those respondents who replied that the education bureau gave feedback based on their reports, 6 (67%) individuals disclosed that the feedbacks given by the education bureau were not useful, while 3 (33%) of them said that the feedbacks were very useful.

From these responses, one can understand that the education bureau did not give feedbacks to most of the NGOs based on their reports. Even though it gave feedbacks to some of them, the feedbacks seemed not as such useful. The data obtained through interview also reveal that the bureau did not give feedbacks due to shortage of project experts. This negatively influences the effectiveness of the projects’ implementation.

Concerning the technical assistance given by the education bureau (item 5), most (90%) of the respondents reported that the education bureau did not provide them technical assistance to facilitate and improve the management of the projects. On the other hand, only 10 (9%) of them said that they got technical assistance from the education bureau. Moreover, according to concerned officials of the education bureau, technical assistance was given only when implementing NGOs requested.

In item 6 of the above table, the project personnel were asked whether their organizations generally managed the projects according to the agreement with the education bureau. Majority (86%) of them responded ‘yes”, whereas 15 (14%) individuals disclosed that their organizations did not generally manage the projects in line with the agreement.
This might indicate that the education bureau did not have a control mechanism that obliges all the NGOs work according to the agreement reached. This might encourage the NGOs to work out of the agreement (the right track) that helps them to achieve objectives of the projects.

Table 16: Participation of Direct Beneficiaries in All Stages of the Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiaries</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion about the objectives of the education project at identification and preparation stages</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Discussed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not discussed</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If discussed about the objectives</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Accepted the objectives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not accepted</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation in the appraisal of the project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Participated</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not participated</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Request to suggest and/or comment on the execution of the project</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Requested</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not requested</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>As a result of your suggestion and/or comment, improvement was:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Made</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not made</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Participation in the monitoring and evaluation of the project</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Participated</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not participated</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 portrays the participation of direct beneficiaries in all stages of the projects. Accordingly, to the question “Did you get a chance to discuss about the objectives of
the education project at identification and preparation stages?”, majority (83 %) of the beneficiaries checked “no”, whereas 19 (17 %) of them answered “yes”. In item 2 of the table, those respondents who said “yes” were asked whether they accepted the objectives of the projects from the beginning and all (100 %) of them answered “yes”.

With regard to project appraisal (item 3), most (93 %) of the respondents replied that they did not participate in the appraisal of the projects through filling a questionnaire, attending a meeting, etc. Eight (7 %) of them, however, reported that they participated in the project appraisal process.

As presented in item 4 of the table, the respondents were asked if they were requested to suggest and/or comment on the execution of the projects. Thus, majority (62 %) of them responded that they did not get the chance to do so; while the remaining 43 (38 %) of them answered that they were able to suggest and/or comment on the execution of the projects. Nevertheless, when the latter ones were asked whether there was any change/improvement made as a result of their suggestions and/or comments, 27 (63 %) of them reported no change/improvement was observed, whereas the rest (37 %) said there was improvement.

To the question “Did you participate in the monitoring and evaluation of the projects through filling a questionnaire, getting an interview or attending a meeting?”, more than three-third (69 %) of the beneficiaries answered “no”, while the remaining 35 (31 %) of them said they participated in the monitoring and evaluation of the projects.

As we can understand from the responses given, majority (63 – 93 %) of the beneficiaries were not involved in all stages i.e. identification, preparation, appraisal, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the projects and this might lead to low acceptance and sense of ownership on the side of the beneficiaries.
Table 17; Participation of Other Concerned Bodies in All Stages of the Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indirect beneficiaries of the project (concerned community members) were:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Involved in all stages</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not involved</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The level of their involvement was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Medium</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Low</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concerned local political leaders were:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Involved in all stages</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not involved in all stages</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The level of their involvement was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Low</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other concerned stakeholders such as organizations working on the same area of intervention were:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Involved in all phases</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Not involved in all phases</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The level of their involvement was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Low</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the participation of indirect beneficiaries i.e. concerned community members, local political leaders and other stakeholders in all stages of the projects. With respect to indirect beneficiaries (item 1), more than half (55 %) of the project...
personnel confirmed that concerned community members were not involved in all stages of the projects, whereas 49 (45%) of them reported the involvement of the community members. However, as far as the level of their involvement is concerned, majority (82%) of them disclosed their involvement was low, while 6 (12%) and other 3 (6%) respondents leveled their involvement as medium and high respectively.

To the question "Were concerned local political leaders involved in all phases of the project?", 66 (79%) of the project personnel checked "no", whereas 34 (31%) of them answered "yes". In item 4 of the table, those respondents who responded "yes" were asked to tell the level of involvement and majority (82%) of them said the involvement of local political leaders was low, while 3 (9%) and other 3 (9%) respondents leveled their involvement as medium and high respectively.

As presented in item 5 of the table, the respondents were asked if other concerned stakeholders such as organizations working on the same area of interventions etc were involved in all phases of the projects. Accordingly, majority (84%) of them responded that the stakeholders were not involved. Nonetheless, 18 (16%) of them cited the involvement of concerned stakeholders in all phases of the projects and out of these respondents, 15 (83%) and the rest 3 (17%) reported that their involvement was low and high respectively.

The responses given indicate that majority of the NGOs might not involve indirect beneficiaries i.e. concerned community members, local political leaders and other stakeholders in all stages of the projects due to shortage of resources and lack of awareness. Even though they involved, the level of involvement seems low and this might lead to over utilization of project resources, low acceptance and less sustainability (World Bank, 1996: 232; Oakley et al, 1991:14-18 and Girma, 2004: 7).

3.2.5. Major Problems Encountered

According to the data collected through open-ended question items of the two questionnaires and the interview, the respondents i.e. both project personnel and direct beneficiaries as well as concerned project experts and officials, pointed out various
problems encountered at different stages of the projects. The major and repeatedly cited problems were summarized here under (in table 18).

Table 18: Problems Faced at Different Stages of the Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Problems Identified/encountered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Problems Related to Project Identification, Preparation and Appraisal</td>
<td>• Lack of awareness and understanding of project ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Low participation of professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficulty to identify specific needs of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shortage of skilled human power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Problems Related to Project Implementation</td>
<td>• Inadequate fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delayed release of fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost overruns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delayed start up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of devotion and enthusiasm of key personnel to the projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor group spirit among employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of necessary support and acceptance from local government side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shortage of trained teachers for special need education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unavailability of nationally developed curriculum for handicapped learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing and facility problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Problems Related to Project Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>• Shortage of budget and time for M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of understanding about the importance of M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resistance to accept constructive comments and suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nonexistence of feedbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Underutilization of feedbacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be observed in the table, it is not difficult to understand that the problems faced during different stages or phases of the projects might negatively affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the education projects’ management by reducing the overall institutional capacity of the organizations under study.
CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of major findings, conclusions drawn and recommendations given. In order to show how the findings are related to the problem, however, it is important to restate the main purpose of the study, basic questions raised and the research design employed.

It is widely believed that the project approach is useful to speed up and improve the investment process. However, unless projects are properly managed and implemented, the approach cannot be as such useful. That is why it is important to identify and solve various problems that adversely affect the management of education projects.

Hence, the purpose of this study is to identify major problems of managing educational projects which are designed and implemented by various NGOs in Addis Ababa city government and provide possible solutions so as to enhance the effectiveness of the education project management in the region.

In respect to this, the following basic questions were treated:

1. A large part of project identification and preparation work aims at minimizing project management problems. How do these NGOs identify and prepare educational projects?

2. If objectives of the project are clear and consistent with the national education policy, project management can be easier. Hence, are objectives of the projects (designed and implemented by the NGOs) clearly set out and consistent with the existing education policy of the country?

3. What are the major project appraisal problems? Does the Addis Ababa education bureau have adequate and qualified personnel who can appraise the educational projects submitted by the NGOs?
4. What are the common problems faced by the organizations while managing implementation of the projects?

5. What are the main managerial problems in relation to monitoring and evaluation of the projects?

6. Are there efforts made by the education bureau to facilitate and improve the management of Educational projects designed and implemented by such agencies?

7. Do the agencies involve local community and other concerned bodies in all stages of the projects’ cycle and manage the projects according to the education policy and their agreement with the bureau?

With regard to the research design, the descriptive survey method was used where as the main data gathering tools employed were two different questionnaires. Respondents to the questionnaires were key project personnel and direct beneficiaries of the education projects undertaken by the NGOs under this study. Out of 120 copies of the questionnaire distributed among project personnel only 110 (92%) and out of 120 copies of the questionnaire given to direct beneficiaries only 114 (95%) copies were filled, returned back and used for analysis.

In addition to the questionnaires, unstructured interview was conducted with two concerned experts from Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau and other two officials from Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGO’s Affairs team.

The data collected both through the questionnaires and interview were analyzed in percentages and the following major findings were obtained.
4.1. Summary of Major Findings

1. About three-fourth (73 %) of the project ideas were generated by the organizations themselves. However, more than half (53 %) of the project ideas of the education projects were not described, screened and prioritized before going to the next stages.

2. It was found that almost all of the objectives were in line with the education policy of the country and majority of them were very clear and not modified during different phases of the projects. Nonetheless, most of them were not as such technically sound i.e. they were stated just like outputs.

3. It was found out that almost all of the project proposals were self-sufficient i.e. comprised important components of a relatively good project proposal, which might facilitate the implementation of the project, and except some technical limitations, the overall (general) designs of the projects were simple and clear.

4. Majority (64 %) of the project personnel responded that the appraisal criteria used by the Addis Ababa Education Bureau were relevant and adequate to appraise the project proposals. More than half (55 %) of them also confirmed that the results of the appraisal made by the bureau helped them to improve (modify/reshape) the project proposals.

5. Although the bureau had qualified and experienced personnel who could appraise education projects properly, they were not adequate in terms of number. To reduce this problem (shortage of appraisers), the existing plan and project experts used to involve other concerned personnel of the bureau in the appraisal process.

6. Majority (61 %) of the responding NGOs commenced to implement the projects without preparing any implementation plan i.e. only based on the
appraised project plans (proposals) and even some of them started implementation before the education bureau appraised the project proposals.

7. Nearly three-fourth (74%) of the project personnel responded that their organizations established project-implementing units for the projects, whereas one-fourth (26%) of them reported that their organizations did not establish project-implementing units to undertake the projects.

8. The responses show that most (81%) of the NGOs recruited and appointed key project personnel after the implementation was begun and majority (68%) of the respondents reported that they did not get training on development project management in general and/or educational project management in particular.

9. About two-third (64%) of the project personnel replied that the information system in the projects was somewhat good.

10. Nearly three-fourth (73%) of the respondents said that the general organizational situation did not motivate project personnel and increase their commitment to the projects and about half (47%) of them reported that the attrition rate among project personnel was high.

11. It was also found out that inadequate fund, delayed release of fund, cost overruns, delayed start up, lack of devotion and enthusiasm of key personnel to the projects, poor group spirit among employees, lack of necessary support and acceptance from local government side, shortage of trained teachers for special need education, unavailability of nationally developed curriculum for disabled (handicapped) learners and housing and facility problems were cited as major problems encountered during implementation of the projects.

12. Most (89%) of the implementing organizations did not have a separate unit for monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Further more, about three-fourth (66%) of the respondents reported that their organizations gave little attention to M&E,
whereas 22 (20 %) of them stated that no attention was given to M&E in their organizations at all.

13. Majority (69 %) of the project personnel reported that the projects were so far evaluated by the organizations themselves (either by their own staff or through external experts), donor agencies and the Education bureau. Nevertheless, the education bureau and the social and NGOs’ affairs team are only involved in terminal evaluations due to shortage of experts.

14. Though most of the NGOs monitored their projects and evaluated them by conducting various types of evaluation such as ex-anti (before implementation, midterm/ongoing (during implementation), terminal (at the end of the project) and) ex-post (sometime after the project was closed down) evaluations, majority (66 %) of them did not properly utilize the feedbacks and make corrective actions (improvements), which help to achieve desired objectives of the projects.

15. Although, majority (81 %) of the respondents told that their organizations sent quarterly and annual reports to the education bureau according to the agreement, it did not give feedbacks for most of the NGOs based on their reports due to shortage of project experts. Even though it gave feedbacks to some of them, the feedbacks were not as such useful.

16. Most (90 %) of the respondents reported that the education bureau did not provide them technical assistance to facilitate and improve the management of the projects. According to concerned officials of the education bureau, technical assistance was given only when implementing NGOs requested.

17. Majority (63-93 %) of the direct beneficiaries reported that they were not involved in all stages/phases i.e. identification, preparation, appraisal, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the projects through different
ways such as filling a questionnaire, getting an interview, attending a meeting, etc. Even though some of them were involved, the level of their involvement was low.

18. The responses given indicate that majority (68 %) of the NGOs did not involve indirect beneficiaries i.e. concerned community members, local political leaders and other stakeholders such as organizations working on the same area of interventions etc in all phases/stages of the projects. Although some of them were involved, the level of their (82 %) involvement was low.

19. Majority (86 %) of project personnel responded that their organizations generally managed the projects according to the agreement with the education bureau, whereas some (14 %) of them disclosed that their organizations did not generally manage the projects in line with the agreement.

4. 2. Conclusion

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn in line with the basic questions.

As one can understand from the findings, even though majority of the project ideas were generated by the organizations themselves, more than half of them were not described, screened and prioritized before going to the next stages. This can imply that the projects’ ideas might not be relatively best, if they would be screened and prioritized based on relevant criteria. On the other hand, except some technical limitations, almost all of the project proposals were self-sufficient and the over all designs of the projects were to some extent simple and clear. Hence, it is safe to conclude that the general designs of the projects may have a positive contribution to their implementation. This is because the simplicity and clarity of a project design can simplify the execution of the project.
In terms of the objectives, although almost all of the projects' objectives were consistent with the national education policy and majority of them were clear, it was found that most of them were not technically sound, meaning they were stated just like outputs. This leads one to infer that the immediate objectives are not as such easy to be measured for they seem not specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound (SMART) and this limitation of the objectives may adversely affect the results of monitoring and evaluation on which corrective measures are taken.

The Addis Ababa Education bureau used relatively relevant appraisal criteria, which might help to improve/modify/reshape the project proposals and had qualified and experienced personnel who could appraise education projects submitted by the NGOs properly. Nevertheless, they (the appraisers) were not adequate in terms of number. Hence, it cannot be wrong to generalize that the appraisal process may take relatively long period of time and/or quality of the appraisal might be reduced in such away that the over all management of the projects can be adversely affected. The reason is that the quality of a project appraisal and the time it takes can influence the achievement of the project's objectives.

As we can understand from the findings, commencing the projects' implementation without preparing any implementation plan and even before appraisal, recruiting and appointing key project personnel after the implementation is begun, lack of training, lack of general organizational situation (work environment) that motivates project personnel and increases their commitment to the projects and other difficulties mentioned above (Finding No11) were the common problems faced by the organizations while managing implementation of the projects. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that these bottlenecks might adversely affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects' implementation in particular and the overall project management in general.
Even though most of the implementing NGOs did not have a separate unit for monitoring and evaluation, they used to monitor the projects and evaluate them by conducting various types of evaluation and to some extent involving concerned stakeholders. However, since majority of the organizations gave little or no attention to M&E and even did not properly utilize the feedbacks obtained from M&E, it seems that they were not in a position to make corrective actions (improvements) based on the results of monitoring and evaluation, and this might minimize the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects’ management.

Except appraising the education project proposals and sometimes participating in terminal evaluations of some of the projects, since the education bureau neither provided technical assistance nor gave feedbacks based on their quarterly and annual reports to the most of the organizations, it might not be difficult to deduce that the efforts made by the education bureau were not as such satisfactory to improve the management of the educational projects designed and implemented by the agencies.

It was also found out that the majority of the NGOs did not properly involve direct and indirect beneficiaries, local political leaders and other stakeholders in all phases/stages of the projects. Thus, it is safe to conclude that this practice might cause low level of acceptance and sense of ownership, as well as less sustainability of the projects and other factors that lead to poor management of the projects.

Generally stating, however, majority of the organizations managed the projects according to the agreement with the education bureau, whereas some of them did not. This might imply that the education bureau did not have an appropriate control mechanism that obliges all the NGOs work according to the agreement reached so as to insure better education projects’ management in the capital.
4.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings obtained and conclusions drawn the following recommendations are forwarded.

1. Project Identification

In order to identify (select) relatively most important education projects that can contribute to the growth and improvement of the education system, the NGOs should generate as many project ideas as possible and systematically describe, screen and prioritize them based on relevant criteria, which consider societal needs (high demand), number of people and geographic areas affected by the projects, the need to solve serious problems confronted by the education system and availability of enough human and financial resources and support for the implementation of the projects etc.

Furthermore, the donor agencies, umbrella organizations like Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA) and the education bureau should also assist the organizations particularly those NGOs, which lack adequate human resource to select relatively best projects that can solve major problems of the education system and require simple implementation process.

2. Project Objectives

To measure the progresses of a project and make appropriate corrective actions, the immediate objectives must be technically sound instead of being stated just like outputs. Therefore, the NGOs should state the projects as specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bounded (SMART) as possible and continue to keep the overall (general) designs of the projects simple and clear and maintain the project proposals self-sufficient in such a way that implementation problems will be reduced.

3. Project Appraisal

As the results indicate, the Addis Ababa Education bureau had inadequate number of project experts (personnel) who could appraise, monitor and evaluate all the education
projects designed and implemented by the NGOs properly. To change this situation (reduce this problem) and provide better services, the bureau should:

➢ Give due attention to the issue and assign extra education project experts by discussing with the concerned officials of the city administration and/or the Ministry of Education (MOE).

➢ Keep involving other concerned personnel of the bureau in the appraisal process.

➢ Involve plan and program experts, education team leaders and supervisors working at sub-city and kebele levels in the appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of the projects by providing them a training on education project management.

4. Project Implementation

In order to assure better project implementation that enables to achieve the desired goals and objectives of the projects, it is advisable to be cautious before the difficulties occur and curb the drawbacks as much as the capacity of the implementing organizations allows. Hence, the NGOs should:

❖ Not commence implementation before the project proposals are appraised and improved accordingly.

❖ Prepare relevant implementation plan, before starting to implement the projects based on the appraised project plans (proposals), to bridge between the project as a concept and the project as an operating production facility.

❖ Establish project-implementing units or adjust the existing organizational structures depending on the size and nature of the projects.
Try to recruit and appoint key project personnel before implementation of a project is begun so that they are engaged in planning of the implementation and gain detailed understanding of the project.

Train the project personnel on development project management in general and/or educational project management in particular in collaboration with donor agencies, training institutes, the education bureau and other concerned bodies like CRDA.

Motivate the project personnel through training, recognition, promotion, giving them responsibility, applying good leadership and appropriate conflict resolution mechanisms and the like so that they develop devotion and enthusiasm to the projects; create good group spirit among them and reduce the attrition rate.

5. Implementation Problems
In order to at least minimize other problems faced by the organizations during implementation of the projects i.e. inadequate fund, delayed release of fund, delayed start up, shortage of trained teachers for special need education, unavailability of nationally developed curriculum for disabled (handicapped) learners and housing and facility problems, the organizations should take care while planning (designing) the projects; create good relationship with their donor agencies, other concerned government and non government organizations working on similar areas of interventions and try to find possible ways such as lobbing and awareness raising that help to mitigate the difficulties.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation
Since monitoring and evaluation plays a vital role to make corrective actions (improvements) while managing the projects, it is very important to pay serious attention to M&E. Thus, the implementing NGOs, the education bureau and the donor
agencies should allocate budget for M&E and monitor and evaluate the projects according to the plans and the agreements reached.

Beyond conducting monitoring and evaluation, however, the implementing organizations should properly utilize the feedbacks acquired through M&E so as to keep the management of the projects on the right track. Besides, the education bureau and the donor agencies should follow up so that the organizations make use of the results obtained from M&E.

7. Feedbacks and Technical Assistance
In order to improve the overall management of the educational projects designed and implemented by the agencies in the capital, the education bureau has to:

- Give useful and constructive feedbacks to the organizations based on their performances i.e. monitoring and evaluation results and accomplishment (achievement) reports.

- Provide technical assistance by conducting additional need assessments.

- Have an appropriate control mechanism that obliges all the NGOs operate and generally manage the projects according to the agreements reached.

8. Participation
Active and proper participation of community members and other concerned bodies in all stages of the project cycle can be seen as the major remedy for alleviating various problems related to low acceptance and support and as a means of insuring high level of sense of ownership and sustainability. Therefore, the NGOs should properly and continuously involve direct and indirect beneficiaries, local political leaders and other stakeholders in all phases/stages of the projects through different ways such as meetings, workshops focus group discussions etc.
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A Questionnaire to be Completed by Key Project Personnel

This questionnaire is designed to identify major problems of managing educational projects designed and implemented by NGOs so that possible solutions will be suggested.

N.B:
- The researcher recognizes time scarcity and work overburden of key project personnel. Apart from this, however, the investigator believes that you will kindly cooperate for you know the ultimate purpose and advantages of such study.
- You (your organization) may be engaged in the management (undertaking) of different development projects. Nevertheless, this questionnaire is only concerned with the education project/s on which the organization reached agreement with Education Bureau of the Addis Ababa City Government. Therefore, you are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire accordingly.

Remark:
1. Do not write your name
2. Your responses will be kept confidential and used only for academic purposes.
3. Failure to complete the questionnaire properly or to leave some items unanswered will heavily affect the study. So it is of a great help not to leave any question unanswered or uncompleted.

General Direction:
Please respond to the items in the questionnaire by placing a check mark (✓) inside the box of your choice and write short and brief answers to open ended question items.
1. Sex
   - Female ☐
   - Male ☐

2. Age
   - a) ≤ 25 ☐
   - b) 26 – 35 ☐
   - c) 36-45 ☐
   - d) 46-55 ☐
   - e) ≥ 56 ☐

3. Current position
   - a) Project manager ☐
   - b) Project/program coordinator ☐
   - c) Project officer ☐
   - d) Monitoring and evaluation expert ☐
   - e) Other (please specify) ________________________

4. Qualification
   - a) Certificate ☐
   - b) Diploma ☐
   - c) First degree ☐
   - d) Second and/or third degree ☐

5. Work experience in the area of development project management:
   - a) ≤ 1 year ☐
   - b) 2-4 years ☐
   - c) 5-7 years ☐
   - d) 8 – 10 years ☐
   - e) ≥11 years ☐

6. Have you ever got training on development project management in general and/or educational project management in particular?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☐

7. From what persons or groups or organization did the idea for this project come originally?
   - a) The organization itself ☐
   - b) The donor agency ☐
   - c) Other, please specify ________________________

8. Was the idea of this project described, screened and prioritized based on some criteria among other project ideas?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☐
   - Do not know ☐

9. What were the main problems encountered during the identification stage of the project? Please describe in brief?: ________________________________

10. To what extent are objectives of the project clear and vivid?
    - a) Extremely clear ☐
    - b) Very clear ☐
    - c) Somewhat clear ☐
    - d) Not clear ☐

11. Do you think that objectives of the project closely adhere to the current education policy of the country? Yes ☐
    - No ☐
    - Do not know ☐
Please write the main objectives of the project 1. ________________________________  
2. ________________________________  
3. ________________________________  

12. Were objectives of the project modified during different phases of the project?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Do not know [ ]  
   If yes, please explain how and why: _____________________________________________  

13. Do you think that the project proposal was self-sufficient and well designed before submission?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Do not know [ ]  

14. Did the content of the project proposal include:  
   a) Background and justification of the project? Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   b) Objectives and beneficiaries of the project? Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   c) Outputs, activities and inputs of the project? Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   d) Organization and management, budget etc. of the project? Yes [ ] No [ ]  

15. Was the project plan (proposal) ever revised?  
   a) Major revisions made frequently [ ] c) Only minor revision was made [ ]  
   b) Major revisions made once or twice [ ] d) No revision was made [ ]  

16. Do you believe that the general design of the project was simple and clear?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]  

17. What were the main problems faced during the preparation /formulation stage of the project? Please describe the problems briefly:  
   ______________________________________  

18. What were the measures taken to solve such problems? :  
   ______________________________________  

19. Did you appraise the project proposal before submitting it to donor agencies and/or the education bureau?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   If yes, by whom was it analyzed with in the institution? by:  
   a) Project manager [ ]  c) Project coordinator [ ]  
   b) Project officer [ ]  d) The whole staff [ ]  
   e) Other, specify ____________________________________________
20. Do you think that the appraisal criteria used by the Addis Ababa Education Bureau were adequate to appraise the project? Yes □ No □ Do not know □
If no, what do you suggest to improve the criteria? _____________________________

21. Do you think that the education bureau has adequate and qualified personnel who appraise education projects properly? Yes □ No □ Do not know □

22. Did the results of the appraisal made by the education bureau help you to improve (modify/reshape) the project proposal? Yes □ No □

23. What were the main problems encountered while the appraisal process was going on? _____________________________________________________________

24. What did you do to mitigate the problems? _____________________________________________________________

25. After the appraisal was over, did you immediately start to implement the project only based on the appraised project plan (Proposal)? Yes □ No □
If no, what did you do? _____________________________________________________________

26. Did the organization establish a project-implementing unit for this project? Yes □ No □
If no, who is responsible to implement the project? Specify _____________________________

27. Did you participate in the implementation planning of the education project? Yes □ No □

28. Were the key project personnel recruited after the implementation of the project started? Yes □ No □

29. The information system in the project (project communication):
a) Very good □ b) Somewhat good □ c) Not good □

30. Do you think that the general organizational situation has motivated project personnel and increased their commitment to the project? Yes □ No □
31. The attrition rate among project personnel is:
   a) High   □   b) Medium   □   c) Low   □   d) No Attrition at all

32. What were the main problems encountered during the implementation of the project?

What were the activities made to curb these problems?

33. The attention given to monitoring and evaluation in the organization is:
   a) Very high   □   c) Little   □   b) High   □   d) Not attention is given   □

34. Does the organization have a separate Monitoring and Evaluation Unit?
   Yes   □   No   □

If yes, does the unit have adequate and qualified personnel?
   Yes   □   No   □

If your answer is no, for the main question, who does monitor and evaluate the project?

35. Was the project ever evaluated?   Yes   □   No   □

   • If yes, who did evaluate it?
     a) The organization itself (by its own staff)   □
     b) The organization itself through external experts   □
     c) The donor agency   □
     d) The Education bureau   □
     e) Other, specify ____________________________

   ▶ If yes, what was the type of evaluation made? (Check all which apply):
     a) Ex-anti (before, implementation)   □
     b) Midterm/ongoing (during implementation)   □
     c) Terminal (at the end of the project)   □
     d) Ex-post (sometime after the project was closed down)   □

36. Did the organization utilize the feedbacks gained through monitoring and evaluation and make some improvements?   Yes   □   No   □

37. Does the organization send reports to the education bureau according to the agreement?   Yes   □   No   □

If yes, it reports (check all which apply):
38. Does the education bureau give feedback based on your report?
   Yes ☐   No ☐
   If yes, to what extent is the feedback useful?
   a) Extremely useful ☐   c) Somewhat useful ☐
   b) Very useful ☐   d) Not useful ☐

39. What were the main problems met while managing monitoring and evaluation?
   Describe briefly:
   What were the measures taken to minimize the problems?

40. Were direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project i.e. concerned community members involved in all stages of the project? Yes ☐   No ☐
   If yes, the level of their involvement was:
   a) High ☐   b) Medium ☐   c) Low ☐

41. Were concerned local political leaders involved in all phases of the project? Yes ☐   No ☐
   If yes, the level of their involvement was:
   a) High ☐   b) Medium ☐   c) Low ☐

42. Were other concerned stakeholders such as organizations working on the same area etc involved in all phases of the project? Yes ☐   No ☐
   If yes, the level of their involvement was:
   a) High ☐   b) Medium ☐   c) Low ☐

43. Does the education bureau provide you technical assistance to facilitate and improve the management of the project/s? Yes ☐   No ☐
   If yes, describe some of the technical assistances:

44. Does the organization generally manage the project/s according to the agreement with the education bureau? Yes ☐   No ☐
   If no, what are your reasons?
45. Please decide/judge the potential seriousness of each of the following difficulties (problems) throughout the project by checking the appropriate box after each item. You can also add your own items and check accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely serious</th>
<th>Very Serious</th>
<th>Somewhat serious</th>
<th>Observed but not serious</th>
<th>Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inadequate fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delayed release of fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cost overruns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delayed start up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of devotion and enthusiasm of key personnel to the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poor information system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Institutional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lack of necessary support and acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management problems in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much!
A Questionnaire to be completed by direct project beneficiaries

This questionnaire is designed to identify major problems of managing educational projects designed and implemented by NGOs so that possible solutions will be suggested.

N.B:

• The researcher recognizes time scarcity and work overburden. Apart from this, however, the investigator believes that you will kindly cooperate for you know the ultimate purpose and advantages of such study.

• You (your organization) may be engaged in the management (undertaking) of different development projects. Nevertheless, this questionnaire is only concerned with the education project/s on which the organization reached agreement with Education Bureau of the Addis Ababa City Government via A.A Civil and Social affairs Bureau. Therefore, you are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire accordingly.

Remark: 1. Do not write your name
2. Your responses will be kept confidential and used only for academic purposes.
3. Failure to complete the questionnaire properly or to leave some items unanswered will heavily affect the study. So it is of a great help not to leave any question unanswered or uncompleted.

General Direction:

Please respond to the items in the questionnaire by placing a check mark (✓) inside the box of your choice and write short and brief answers to open ended question items.
1. Sex  
   - Female □
   - Male □

2. Age  
   a) ≤ 15 □
   b) 16 – 25 □
   c) 26 - 35 □
   d) 36 - 45 □
   e) 46 - 55 □
   f) ≥ 56 □

3. Education Level  
   a) Illiterate □
   b) Literate □
   c) Grade four complete □
   d) Grade eight complete □
   e) Secondary Education □
   f) Above Secondary Educ. □

4. Did you get a chance to discuss about the objectives of the education project undertaken by _______ at identification and preparation stages (before its implementation started)?
   - Yes □
   - No □

5. If your answer is “yes” for the above question, have you accepted the objectives of the project from the beginning?
   - Yes □
   - No □

   What was the reason that helped you to accept or not? ________________________________

6. Do you currently know what objectives of the project are?
   - Yes □
   - No □

   If yes, please describe the main objectives:
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________
   3. -----------------------------------

7. Did you participate in the appraisal of the project through filling a questionnaire, attending a meeting, etc?
   - Yes □
   - No □
8. If your answer is “yes” for question number 7, what were the main problems faced during the appraisal process?

1 __________________________________________________________

2 __________________________________________________________

3 __________________________________________________________

9. Did you observe any execution problem during the implementation of the project?

   Yes ☐    No ☐

   If yes, please describe the problems briefly.

   1 __________________________________________________________

   2 __________________________________________________________

   3 __________________________________________________________

10. Have you ever faced difficulties/problems as a project beneficiary?

   Yes ☐    No ☐

   If yes, please describe the problems briefly.

   1 __________________________________________________________

   2 __________________________________________________________

   3 __________________________________________________________

11. Have you ever been requested to suggest and/or comment on the execution of the project?

   Yes ☐    No ☐

   If yes, is there any change/improvement made based on your suggestion and/or comment?

   Yes ☐    No ☐

12. Do you believe that you get benefit from the project?

   Yes ☐    No ☐

13. Did you participate in the monitoring and evaluation of the project through filling a questionnaire, getting an interview, attending a meeting, etc?

   Yes ☐    No ☐
If your answer is “yes” for the above question, what were the main problems faced during monitoring and evaluation?

1
2
3

14. Please list out the difficulties (problems) faced throughout the project implementation that should be solved:

1
2
3
4
5

Thank you very much!
Interview Guideline

A guideline of an interview made with project experts and officials of Addis Ababa Education Bureau and Civil and Social Affairs Office, NGOs Affairs team.

1. The general situation of project experts assigned by the bureau/office to appraise, monitor and evaluate the education projects submitted by the NGOs?
   - Educational level
   - Work experience and Training
   - Number of project experts in terms of the workload

2. How does the bureau/office appraise, monitor and evaluate the education projects submitted by the NGOs?
   - Appraisal Criteria
   - Methods used to monitor and evaluate the projects
   - When and how the bureau gives feedbacks (disclose results)?
   - The way through which the bureau provides technical assistance to the organizations

3. Are the project proposals submitted by the NGOs for appraisal appropriate and self-sufficient?
   - In terms of content
   - The nature of objectives (are they technically sound and in line with the current education policy of the country?)
   - Simplicity and clarity of project designs

4. What are the situations and the level of community participation during the identification, preparation and implementation phases of the education projects and while the bureau/office appraises, monitors and evaluates the projects?
   - Direct project beneficiaries
   - Indirect project beneficiaries
   - Concerned local political leaders
   - Other stakeholders

5. What are the main problems of the education projects designed and implemented by the NGOs?
   - Problems related to project Identification
   - Problems related to project preparation
   - Problems related to project Appraisal
   - Problems related to project Implementation
   - Problems related to monitoring and evaluation
   - General project management problems

6. What are the possible solutions that can be suggested to solve the problems?
   - In terms of the general capacity of the organizations
   - In terms of the number and quality of the project personnel the education bureau has
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