



Addis Ababa University  
College of Business and Economics  
Department of Accounting and Finance

**An Assessment of Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practices: The Case of  
International NGOs**

By: Getinet Teferi Tessema (GSD/6508/13)

*A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of  
Science degree in Accounting and Finance.*

Advisor: Temesgen Worku (PhD)

June 2024

### Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this research thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any university. I acknowledge that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Declared By:

Name: Getinet Teferi

Signature: 

Date: 23/08/2024

Confirmed By Advisor

Name: Pemessa W.

Signature: 

Date: 23/08/2024

Place and Date of submission: \_\_\_\_\_

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Business and Economics**

**Department of Accounting and Finance**

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Getinet Teferi, entitled 'Assessment of Project M & E Practice: The Case of International NGO,' and submitted to partially meet the specified requirements for the Master of Accounting and Finance (MSC) Degree, adheres to the University's regulatory requirements and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Accepted by Examiner Committee:

Internal Examiner:	<u>Dr. Mehaer</u>	Signature	<u>[Signature]</u>	Date	<u>23/08/2024</u>
External Examiner:	<u>Mebratu L. (PhD)</u>	Signature	<u>[Signature]</u>	Date	<u>23/08/2024</u>
Advisor:	<u>[Signature]</u>	Signature	<u>[Signature]</u>	Date	<u>23/08/2024</u>

Department Chair or Coordinator of the Graduate Program

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I express my gratitude to the Almighty God. My deepest thanks go to my advisor, Temesgen Worku, PhD, for his priceless guidance, guidance, and constructive feedback during the course of this study. I would also like to express my appreciation to my family and friends for their support, and invaluable advice in all aspects of my life. Last but not least, I extend my thanks to my friends and colleagues who provided me with the necessary assistance during the completion of my thesis."

I,

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	I
List of Tables .....	III
Acronyms .....	IV
Abstract .....	V
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	2
1.2 Statement of the problem .....	3
1.3 Research Questions .....	5
1.4 Objective of the Study .....	5
1.4.1 General Objective .....	5
1.4.2 Specific Objective .....	5
1.5 Scope of the Study .....	6
1.6 Limitation of the Study .....	6
1.7 Significance of the Study .....	6
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
2. Literature Review .....	8
2.1 Theoretical Review .....	10
2.2 Monitoring .....	11
2.3 Types of Evaluation .....	12
2.4 Empirical Literature Review .....	13
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
Research Methodology .....	19
3.1 Introduction.....	19
3.2 Research Design.....	19
3.3 Research population.....	20
3.4 Sample size and Selection.....	20
3.5 Data Collection Methods .....	25
3.6 Data Analysis Method.....	25
3.7 Ethical Issues .....	25
<b>Chapter 4, Data presentation, analysis and Interpretation</b>	
4.1, Introduction .....	26

II

4.2 Questioner Response Rate.....26

4.3 General Information about the respondent.....27

4.4, presentation, analysis, and interpretation of Data.....29

**Chapter 5- Summary, conclusion, and recommendations**

5.1 Introduction.....70

5.2 Summary of findings .....71

5.3 Conclusion.....74

5.4 Recommendation.....75

References.....78

Annex .....80

III

## Acronyms

AAU- Addis Ababa University

(ACF)- Action Against Hunger

ACSO- Authority for Civil Society Organizations

CCRDA – Consortium of Christian Relief and Development Association

CSO- Civil Society Organizations

(Jhpiego)- Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics

INGO- International Non-Governmental Organization

M&E- Monitoring and Evaluation

NGO- Non-Governmental Organization

(PSI)-Population Service International

SPSS – Statical Package for the Social Sciences

(WASH)- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

(ZOA)- Zionist Organization of America

## **Abstract**

*Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) is a systematic process used to track and assess the progress, performance, and outcomes of projects, programs, or initiatives. This method involves the continuous collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure that objectives are being met efficiently and to provide insights for informed decision-making. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) play a pivotal role in the success of development projects, allowing project managers to track progress, identify challenges, and make informed decisions. This study focuses on assessing the project monitoring and evaluation practice in five international NGOs (Action Against Hunger (ACF), Population Service International (PSI), Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), Jhpiego (Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics), and Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity) operating in Ethiopia. By assessing the monitoring and evaluating practices and project performance, the research aims to contribute to a better understanding of achieving optimal project results. The study employed a census sampling method to collect primary data through questionnaires and interviews. Participants included program managers, program staff, finance managers, finance staff, M&E managers, and directors who worked more than a year in the organization. Out of the 70 distributed questionnaires, 67 were properly filled in and returned. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS, and the results were presented using tables. Findings revealed that the international NGOs involved relevant stakeholders, including beneficiaries, government, donors, and the community, in their M&E activities. However, the gap in practicing & implementing effective M&E systems were identified, such as limited resources in terms of funding, staff, and technical expertise. In conclusion, while the international NGOs have well-established M&E systems, improvements are needed in certain areas. Recommendations include clarifying the extent and objective of the of the M&E (Monitoring and Evaluation) system, providing adequate time and training for project staff, enhancing technical capacity in M&E tools, allocating sufficient budget to the M&E department, involving all stakeholders in M&E practices, ensuring the engagement of top management, and utilizing M&E evaluation reports to monitor project progress.*

Keywords: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), International Non-Governmental Organizations (International NGOs)."

## **Chapter One**

### **1, Introduction**

This research explores the monitoring and evaluation M&E practice, practices and challenges faced by international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) located in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The chapter covers the study's background, problem statement, general and specific objectives, research questions, conceptual framework, significance, justification, and the research scope.

Ethiopia has a rich history and extensive experience with civil society and charity organizations, implementing diverse programs. The number and significance of NGOs increased significantly, especially after the drought crises in the early 1970s and mid-1980s (Birhanu Adinew, 2006). According to Dessalegn et al. (2009), the evaluation of the non-profit sector in Ethiopia has been strongly influenced by two major factors.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), also known as charities and civil societies, play a crucial role in the institutional fabric of Ethiopian society, much like in other countries. However, Ethiopia's unique context, when compared to many other African nations, means that the NGO community here is not as mature in terms of diversity, size, and capacity. Over the past three decades, this community has experienced growth in size, diversification, and self-organization, actively contributing to the national socio-economic processes (Belay Kebede, 2015).

The rise of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Ethiopia is closely tied to the severe famine in Wollo and Tigray during the early 1970s. In response, the imperial regime allowed international and local NGOs to engage in relief and rehabilitation activities. In 1973, the Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA) was established as an umbrella organization for NGOs, primarily faith based. The tragic famine in the mid-1980s further catalyzed the establishment of additional NGOs in the country, aiming to contribute to relief efforts. In 2009, a proclamation was enacted to regulate NGOs in Ethiopia.

The recently enacted Authority for Civil Society Organizations Proclamation No. 1113/2019 (CSP/2019) has replaced many of the restrictive rules outlined in the CSP/2009. The new proclamation classifies Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) into two primary types:

1. Local CSOs: These organizations are established under Ethiopian laws and can be founded by either Ethiopians or foreigners residing in Ethiopia, or an amalgamation of both.
2. Foreign CSOs: These entities are founded in accordance with the legal provisions of another country and are registered to operate in Ethiopia.

Based on the most recent data from the Regulatory body, Authority for Civil Society Organizations (ACSO), approximately 440 foreign CSOs and 3,200 local CSOs are registered or re-registered to operate in Ethiopia under ACSO's supervision. For the objective of this study, the researcher has specifically chosen five foreign NGOs currently active in Ethiopia.

Donor agencies significantly influence the selection and definition of projects earmarked for funding (Polidano and Hulme, 2009). As a result, ensuring the effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation, M&E, practices becomes crucial, especially considering the substantial resources provided by these donor agencies.

### **1.1, Background of the study**

Donor-funded projects play a pivotal role in allocating resources to improve the living standards of people worldwide, especially in critical domains such as healthcare, WASH (Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene), nutrition, education, and food security. To ensure the lasting impact and benefits of these projects, the implementation of enhanced monitoring and evaluation techniques. (M&E) practices is considered essential (Ahsan and Gunawan, 2010).

In light of this necessity, project management has seamlessly integrated M&E design into the quality assurance process. This integration helps project teams clearly define their objectives and create practical plans that outline the necessary resources and how project outputs can lead to developmental transformations. However, it's crucial to acknowledge that several projects in Africa have faced challenges, resulting in the inability to achieve their intended goals.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play a crucial role in the success, effectiveness, and sustainability of projects undertaken by non-governmental organizations (NGOs). As these organizations address various social and humanitarian challenges, navigating complex landscapes with limited resources becomes essential.

Alternatively, when it comes to evaluation involves measuring or assessing the outcomes of completed projects to determine their relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability (Rio, 2019). This highlights the importance of evaluation in establishing the performance and efficiency levels of projects. The M&E system serves as a strategic organizational tool to assess if projects have made a difference at different levels. Jurgen (2017) and Prabhakar (2008) also note the practice of overseeing and providing feedback are key factors contributing to project success. Consequently, NGOs face increasing pressure to conduct extensive M&E, presenting measurable indicators of output, impact, and capacity for their projects due to the growing demands for effectiveness and sustainability (Ahmed, 2004).

Monitoring and Evaluation plays a pivotal role in assessing the overall impact and effectiveness of completed projects.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) have gained heightened importance in international development since the mid-2000s, primarily driven by the aid effectiveness agenda. This shift in the motivation of development agencies emphasizes a focus on results and impact, requiring evidence of effectiveness. In response to this evolving demand, numerous organizations have intensified their commitment to M&E, demonstrating increased awareness of the challenges associated with collecting and utilizing the right data. This emphasis aims to enhance work outputs and demonstrate accountability to both donors and beneficiaries.

Monitoring is the ongoing process of collecting and analyzing information about a specific intervention or program, while evaluation is the process of assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of that intervention or program. These definitions underscore that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are continuous processes essential for any organization.

The planning stage of any project involves the incorporation of pertaining to monitoring and evaluation processes as planned activities (Joram, 2019). These processes help organizations align their work and keep management informed about the progress, the difficulties and hurdles of the project activities (Argwins, 2017). When executed effectively, monitoring and evaluation serve as tools for achieving successful and effective project management, providing a robust foundation for evaluation.

Evaluation, in particular, focuses on outcomes and results that can be realized upon concluding the implementation of the project. The evaluation process typically includes a periodic assessment to determine possible changes needed, offering a predetermination of the results associated with the project implementation interventions (Aradi, 2017)."

## **1.2. Statement of the problem**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) data poses a significant challenge to NGOs, impacting their ability to critically meet project objectives. The collection, analysis, and dissemination of data are integral components in every phase of project management (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). Additionally, a further obstacle lies in ensuring that NGOs possess the necessary competence to analyze and effectively utilize the information derived from the systems they use for monitoring and evaluation (Britton, 2009).

Despite the significant number of projects undertaken by the five international NGOs (Action Against Hunger (ACF), Population Service International (PSI), Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), Jhpiego (Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics), and Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity), there remains a crucial need to systematically assess their monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices. While these NGOs monitor and evaluate their progress on a monthly basis—focusing on critical constraints such as cost, time, scope, quality, and resources—there is limited understanding of how effectively these M&E practices are implemented across the various projects. Given the scale and complexity of their operations, it is essential to investigate the M&E strategies used by these organizations to

ensure that they are optimizing project outcomes and resource utilization. This research aims to address this gap by thoroughly examining the monitoring and evaluation practices of the five international NGOs, thereby contributing valuable insights into the effectiveness of their project management processes.

### **1.3. Research Question**

1. How does the Monitoring & Evaluation practice impact the performance of International NGOs?
2. To what extent does the management actively participate in the Monitoring & Evaluation practice?
3. How do skill levels in Monitoring & Evaluation practice systems influence project performance at International NGOs?
4. Does the Government body actively participate in of Monitoring & Evaluation practice at International NGOs?

### **1.4, Objective of the Study**

#### **1.4.1 General Objective**

The primary aim of this study is to evaluate the monitoring and evaluation practices by international NGOs operating in Ethiopia.

#### **1.4.2 Specific Objective**

1. The study seeks to investigate monitoring and evaluation practices.
2. The study aims to identify the challenges organizations face when monitoring and evaluating their projects.
3. The study evaluates the impact of management participation in M&E on project implementation.

### **1.5, Scope of the Study**

The study was conducted within Addis Ababa. The study basically explores the monitoring and evaluation practices of in International NGO. The study is to analyze the practices of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) within international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) operating in Ethiopia. Five International Non-Governmental organization was chosen, with headquarters in both the USA and Europe, creating a diverse population of respondents. These INGOs operate in various sectors, including nutrition, hygiene & sanitation, food security, and agriculture. The selected NGOs are Action Against Hunger (ACF), Population Service International (PSI), Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), Jhpiego (Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics), and Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity).

### **1.6 Limitation of the Study**

The primary limitation of this study lies in its reliance on information provided by project staff from five international NGOs in Ethiopia to assess M&E practices and project performance. The findings are contingent on their perspectives and may not fully encapsulate the diverse range of M&E practices across all INGOs in the country. Furthermore, due to constraints in time and financial resources, a more extensive examination of M&E practices across a larger sample of organizations was not feasible.

The study relies on information provided by project staff from five international NGOs in Ethiopia to assess M&E practices and project performance. Respondents' identities are confidential to ensure confidentiality. Due to time and financial constraints, the study was limited to these five international NGOs.

### **1.7, Significance of the Study**

The study aims to enhance understanding of monitoring, and evaluation practices and their impact on project performance. It will inform strategic programming for donor-funded projects by collecting and analyzing information related to progressive project monitoring and evaluation,

establishing best practices for improved project outcomes. The findings will serve as valuable insights for managers of donor-funded projects, allowing them to identify existing gaps in Monitoring & Evaluation practices and opportunities for improvement. This study particularly helps the NGO's staff, donor agencies and project managers in a better understanding of the monitoring and evaluations practice and how to improve them to meet the expectations of the stakeholders, as well as provide valuable information for future interventions

## **Chapter Two**

### **Literature Review**

Chapter Two delves into relevant literature, emphasizing the significance of evaluation and monitoring systems for the success of International NGO projects. This section reviews existing studies conducted by researchers in the same field, covering key areas such as the theoretical framework, monitoring and evaluation practices, and project performance. The section summarizes the findings and introduces the conceptual framework. Variables explored in this chapter include competency in monitoring and evaluation, stakeholders' participation, cost and budget allocation, and timelines for monitoring and implementation systems.

Project management involves five essential process groups, as outlined by PMI (2013): initiation, planning, execution, monitoring and evaluation, and project closing. Throughout its lifecycle, a project undergoes various stages, including defining objectives, planning the work, executing tasks, monitoring progress, and closing the project upon product acceptance.

1. **Initiation Process Group:** This phase defines and authorizes the project. It officially launches through a project charter, a signed document containing key project details such as purpose, high-level product description, milestone schedule summary, and business case. Tasks include selecting the best project within resource limits, recognizing project benefits, preparing documents for project approval, and assigning the project manager. This phase effectively marks the project's beginning.
2. **Planning Process Group:** Here, the project objectives are refined, and a comprehensive project management plan is developed. The plan consists of various sub-plans outlining actions required to achieve project objectives. Key outcomes include a project scope management plan, a schedule management plan, and a quality management plan. Tasks involve defining work requirements, specifying the quality and quantity of work, identifying necessary resources, and scheduling all project activities. This phase explains the project's goals and expectations.

**Project Executing Process Group:** This phase involves implementing the project plan to achieve its objectives. The primary output is the project's deliverables. Changes, modifications, and omissions are addressed in this stage. The project team is hired, and work commences. Effective team management, adhering to timelines, and reaching project milestones are key aspects. Most of the project's budget is utilized in this process group.

**Project Monitoring and Controlling Process Group:** This group is active throughout the project's lifecycle. It encompasses defending against scope creep, monitoring progress and performance, and implementing corrective actions for any deviations from the plan. Tasks include tracking progress, comparing actual outcomes to predictions, analyzing variances, and making necessary adjustments. It is a crucial phase where the project team can realign with the plan, measure variance, and take corrective action.

**Project Closing Process Group:** This phase involves conducting a project review for lessons learned, verifying the attainment of project objectives, and completing contractual, financial, and administrative closure.

Regarding Monitoring and Evaluation systems:

Monitoring and evaluation systems have historical roots, but their contemporary significance has grown due to stakeholder demands for accountability and transparency. IFRC (2011) emphasizes that Monitoring and Evaluation serve as the foundation for project functioning, reorientation, and future planning. These systems help organizations extract valuable information from past and ongoing activities for reorientation and future planning. Monitoring and Evaluation, as separate yet complementary processes, involve systematically collecting and analyzing information on ongoing projects and comparing their outcomes/impact against intentions. An M&E system, in contrast, is a set of interconnected components serving the common purpose of tracking project implementation and results.

## 2.1 Theoretical Review

The theory of change offers a comprehensive framework outlining the historical and contemporary alterations necessary to achieve long-term goals (Georges, 2017). It provides a detailed account of the changes responsible for planning, execution, and assessment of project activities. As emphasized by Weiss (2018), the theory of change is accompanied by conditions that are essential for the success of project activities.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) serve multiple purposes in project management. Effective M&E is crucial for determining whether planned results are being achieved as intended. While good planning and designs are essential, they alone do not guarantee results; progress towards achieving outcomes needs continuous monitoring. M&E is a process designed to enhance performance and achieve results, linking the past, present, and future. It stands as one of the most powerful tools influencing project performance (Gudda, 2011).

M&E is a key component of project management, providing control over essential parameters such as scope, quality, resources, completion time, and cost (Kerzner, 2017). Evaluation becomes challenging for poorly designed programs lacking systematic progress monitoring (UNDP, 2006). Extracting valuable information from past and ongoing activities for reorientation and future planning becomes difficult without effective M&E (UNDP, 2009). M&E contributes to improving the quality of project interventions, fostering learning, and strengthening project implementation.

For project managers and stakeholders, M&E showcases the extent to which intended goals are achieved. Funders and development partners benefit from M&E's role in maintaining transparency and accountability in the use of project resources. The information developed through the M&E process is vital for improving decision-making (Abalange, 2016).

Theoretically, an ideal M&E system should strike a balance, being independent enough to be externally credible and socially legitimate, yet not so independent that it loses relevance (Briceno, 2010). Thus, M&E should be capable of influencing policymaking based on lessons learned and be sustainable over time to respond to stakeholders' needs.

## **2.2 Monitoring**

Monitoring is a continuous function designed primarily to offer management and key stakeholders' timely insights into the progress or lack thereof in achieving results within an ongoing intervention, such as a project, program, or support to an outcome (UNDP, 2002). Gudda (2011) defines monitoring as the collection of necessary information with minimal effort to make routine decisions at the right time. It is seen as a continuous learning process in which experiences gathered are analyzed and fed back into planning and updated implementation approaches.

Magnen, A. (1991). characterizes monitoring as a system of continuous information for the project manager's use. In the context of monitoring, implementation is viewed as an ongoing learning process where experiences are analyzed and feedback informs planning and updated approaches. The information gathered serves as a vital database for analysis, discussion, evaluation, and reporting.

Monitoring, as a continuing function, systematically collects data on specified indicators to inform management and main stakeholders of the ongoing operation's progress and achievement of results in the use of allocated funds (FRC, 2002). A robust monitoring process focuses on results, records them in reports, makes recommendations, and follows up with decisions and actions (Ritz & Levy, 2013).

Jackson, B. J. (2010). highlights the three primary elements associated with managing a project: quality, cost, and time. Project monitoring tools and mechanisms, including field visits, annual project reports, outcome groups, and annual reviews, are crucial for assessing progress and providing the basis for decision-making (Sinha & Labi, 2011). Baseline assessments conducted at the initial stage establish the line of base conditions against which later comparisons are made (Simon, 2013).

The increasing recognition of the need to develop and apply practical M&E systems is emphasized as an essential tool for program/project management, supporting implementation and providing feedback for the design of new initiatives (Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014))

### 2.3 Types of Evaluation.

1, Start-up Evaluation- this evaluation is conducted before the project started. This is a baseline. At a later stage the effects and impacts of the program/ project can be compared with this baseline data (Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014))

2, Midterm Evaluation -: it happens in the middle of the implementation. What distinguishes it from terminal and ex-post evaluations is that correction to the current project still can be made on the basis of findings and recommendations (Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014))

3, Terminal Evaluation- this evaluation is conducted when the project comes to an end. This evaluation is conducted to assess effectiveness and impact after at the end of project/program implementation.

4, Impact Evaluation- this project is conducted after the project is terminated between 3 to 5 years. To assess the sustainability of the project that has been done. This is rarely conducted due to the funding issue. The Donor must fund to cover the evaluation cost. Based on persons evaluating, scholars classified evaluation into two: internal and external (Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014))

1. Internal evaluation: This type of evaluation is conducted by individuals directly involved in the program or project. Ongoing or formative evaluations may be carried out by the management team or individuals assigned from the implementing agency. Many local non-governmental organizations opt for this type of evaluation due to cost-effectiveness (Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014))

2. External evaluation: This evaluation is performed by individuals external to the program or project. Terminal and ex-post evaluations are frequently carried out by external evaluators. Donors often prefer external evaluators, believing that they can provide a diverse range of expertise and experience not necessarily available within the organization. External evaluators

are also seen to offer more independence and credibility compared to internal evaluators (Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014)

## 2.4, Empirical Literature Review

A study conducted by Mackay and the World Bank in 2007 emphasized the critical role of planning for monitoring and evaluation in improving the performance of government projects. This research focused on the enhancement of government projects during the implementation of monitoring and evaluation practices. The study utilized descriptive statistics, revealing that a significant number of respondents highlighted the absence of effective monitoring and evaluation practices in the various projects they were involved in.

Creswell (2014) defines research design as a framework or approach chosen by researchers to effectively address research problems. The research design serves as a connecting link between research objectives, study questions, empirical studies, recommendations, and conclusions within a given study.

A study conducted by Tengan and Aigbavboa (2017) in Ghana, revealed that while there was some level of stakeholder engagement, the active participation of stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation of public projects at the local government level was limited. This limitation was attributed to factors such as a lack of understanding, knowledge, time, and involvement dedicated to monitoring and evaluation activities by stakeholders.

Singh, Chandurkar, and Dutt (2017) conducted a study that emphasized monitoring and evaluation as a major driving factor in development projects. The primary objective of the study was to assess the impact of monitoring and evaluation on development projects. The study recommended that management should provide full support and actively engage in the monitoring and evaluation process. This active involvement is crucial for making informed decisions and ensuring the success of development projects. As stated by the UNDP (2009),

monitoring and evaluation play a vital role in extracting valuable information for reorientation and future planning based on past and ongoing activities. The effectiveness of work advancement and achievement is challenging to ascertain without the implementation of a robust planning, monitoring, and evaluation framework. Gashaw (2019) conducted a research study with the overarching objective of assessing project monitoring and evaluation practices. Employing a descriptive research approach, the study utilized judgmental sampling to select participants. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were employed. The findings of the study indicated that the organization under scrutiny did not adhere to standard monitoring and evaluation approaches and lacked a baseline assessment before project initiation. In conclusion, the study recommended that the enterprise should establish a robust monitoring and evaluation system, consider hiring skilled personnel or providing training for existing technical staff, and focus on building capacity and expertise. Additionally, the study emphasized the need for the organization to develop its own standardized monitoring and evaluation formats and frameworks.

#### **Why Monitoring & Evaluation is important:**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are pivotal in project management and execution, with several associated critical aspects.

1. **Accountability and Transparency:** Through monitoring and evaluation, projects establish transparent and accountable mechanisms. Donors and other stakeholders can evaluate the project's effectiveness in achieving goals and utilizing resources efficiently.
2. **Learning and Improvement:** Monitoring and evaluation activities extend beyond mere success or failure assessment; they also foster organizational learning. Through discerning effective strategies and areas for enhancement, projects can evolve and enhance their performance over time.
3. **Adaptability:** Projects seldom unfold precisely as anticipated. Monitoring and evaluation enable adaptive management, empowering projects to modify their strategies in response to real-time information, unexpected obstacles, or evolving circumstances.
4. **Stakeholder Engagement:** Timely reporting on project advancements and results via M&E aids in sustaining communication with a spectrum of stakeholders. This

encompasses not just donors but also local communities, governmental bodies, and other entities engaged in or influenced by the project.

To conclude, the structured methodology of monitoring and evaluation guarantees that projects are not only accountable for resource utilization but also equipped with the necessary means to consistently enhance and adjust to the ever-evolving landscape of development endeavors. Monitoring and evaluation are essential elements of project management, particularly in the non-profit sector.

#### Positive Contributions towards Human Development:

Monitoring and evaluation assist in evaluating the extent to which initiatives are positively contributing to human development. Through systematic data collection and analysis, NGOs can gauge the impact of their programs on the intended beneficiaries. This data serves as a valuable resource for refining strategies, enhancing effectiveness, and showcasing the concrete advantages of the initiatives.

#### Management Tool for Donor Accountability:

Monitoring and evaluation function as vital management tools for NGOs to showcase accountability to their donors. Donors frequently seek proof of how their resources are utilized and what results are attained. Monitoring and evaluation offer a systematic method to monitor progress, assess outcomes, and guarantee transparency in fund utilization.

#### Reporting to Donors, Governments, and Stakeholders:

NGOs leverage monitoring data to generate comprehensive reports for diverse stakeholders, such as donors, governments, and other partners. These reports highlight project achievements, hurdles faced, and insights gained throughout implementation. Effective reporting not only meets accountability standards but also fosters trust and credibility among stakeholders.

In conclusion, monitoring and evaluation are pivotal in guaranteeing the success and endurance of NGO initiatives. They equip organizations with essential tools for making evidence-based decisions, ensuring accountability, and fostering transparent communication with stakeholders. This methodical approach enhances the overall efficacy of projects and fosters positive outcomes in human development.

### **The M&E process is:**

Setting up a robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system is crucial for the success of any project, and it involves several key steps:

#### 1. Setting Up Monitoring Plans:

- Identify the key objectives, outcomes, and outputs of the proposed project.
- Develop a detailed monitoring plan outlining the specific indicators, data collection methods, and frequency of monitoring activities.
- Clearly define roles and responsibilities for monitoring tasks within the project team.

#### 2. Collecting Data:

- Choose appropriate data collection methods based on the nature of the project and the indicators being measured. This can include surveys, interviews, focus group discussions, and document reviews.
- Establish a systematic process for data collection, ensuring consistency and reliability.
- Train project staff or local partners involved in data collection to ensure standardization.

#### 3. Validating Data:

- Implement data validation processes to ensure the accuracy and reliability of collected information.
- Use validation techniques such as cross-checking data from different sources, conducting random spot checks, and verifying against established benchmarks.
- Address any discrepancies or errors promptly to maintain the integrity of the data.

#### 4. Managing Data:

- Establish a secure and organized system for data storage and management.
- Utilize data management tools or software to streamline the process and facilitate easy retrieval.
- Implement protocols for data security and confidentiality, particularly when dealing with sensitive information.

#### 5. Analyzing Data:

- Use both quantitative and qualitative analysis methods to interpret the collected data.
- Compare the results against predefined indicators and benchmarks.
- Identify trends, patterns, and areas for improvement.

#### 6. Follow-up on Findings:

- Develop action plans based on the analysis of monitoring data, addressing any identified issues or challenges.
- Communicate findings to relevant stakeholders, including project teams, donors, and beneficiaries.
- Continuously adapt and improve project strategies based on the lessons learned through the monitoring process.

#### 7. Global Standard Indicators and Custom Indicators:

- Align project indicators with global standards to facilitate benchmarking and comparison.
- Develop custom indicators that are specific to the unique goals and activities of the proposed project.
- Ensure that the selected indicators are measurable, realistic, and aligned with the overall objectives of the project.

Through the implementation of these measures, international NGOs can develop a robust monitoring and evaluation system that fosters ongoing enhancement, accountability, and documentation of project accomplishments. Consistent review and adjustment of the monitoring plan guarantee the adaptability and responsiveness of the M&E system to the project's changing requirements.

They will gather data to monitor performance indicators, ensuring that it remains relevant, comprehensive, accurate, and timely. Much of the monitoring process will involve utilizing digital data collection methods.

Numerous studies indicate that a majority of projects encounter failure. In a study conducted by Nigawaba (2018), the aim was to investigate the impact of monitoring and evaluation planning on project performance in Trans Nzoia County. The study evaluated the importance of monitoring and evaluation, along with examining the correlation between evaluation and monitoring plans and project performance. The survey emphasized the effectiveness of M&E systems in organizational success. The limited availability of M&E data has hindered NGOs' capacity to effectively achieve project objectives, as the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data are crucial components in every stage of project management (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010).

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 2018 annual forum, major donors aids to developing countries fell by nearly 5% in 2017 thus breaking a long upward trend since 1997 due to the global recession. It is predicted that continuing tight budgets in OECD countries will put pressures on aid levels over the coming years. Due to this fall in international funds, international donors are all demanding more formal accountability requirements to ensure that their funds are being used to benefit society and meet population needs (Andrew et al., 2009). According to the World Bank (2010), having M&E polices provides an environment in which aid is highly effective and produces very high results. Leeuw (2001) emphasized that M&E is seen as a critical component of more effective aid and the need for it has accelerated to the extent that it has been described as a growth industry and a public good (Leeuw, 2001). Trainings on M&E system should also be provided for the 21-organization staff so that their interest and knowledge can mature to the expected level (Demissie, 2014).

## **Chapter Three**

### **Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides an overview of the research methodology employed in the study. This section covers various essential aspects of the study, including the research design, population, sampling strategy, data collection tools, and procedures. Additionally, it provides information on sample design, validity testing using the research instrument, study design, targeted population, data acquisition approaches, ethical considerations, and the methods used for analyzing data to assess study variables.

#### **3.2, Research Design**

According to Creswell (2014), research design refers to the framework or approaches that researchers choose to effectively address research problems. The primary purpose of research design is to serve as a bridge connecting research objectives, study questions, empirical investigations, recommendations, and study conclusions. In this particular study, a descriptive research design was employed. As outlined by Cooper and Schindler (2000), descriptive research seeks to answer questions related to who, what, where, when, and how much. The chosen research design was well-suited for exploring monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices that impact project performance. Similar research designs have been used to evaluate M&E practices and their influence on project outcomes. According to Creswell (2003), a descriptive study design allows researchers to collect information, summarize data, present findings, and interpret results for the purpose of clarification. The research approach employed in this study was a mixed methods approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods. This approach was chosen to enhance our understanding of project management and evaluation practices.

### **3.3, Research Population**

The research focuses on individuals engaged in project management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and grant management within the context of an international non-governmental organization (NGO). In line with the recommendation of Williams (1997), a subgroup of the total population was chosen to streamline the research process. The goal is to involve 70 staff members in the study from Five International NGO (Action Against Hunger (ACF), Population Service International (PSI), Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), Jhpiego (Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics), and Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity) operating in Ethiopia. Data collection was conducted through surveys, enabling analysis through SPSS software.

### **3.4 Sample size and selection**

The research deliberately selected five international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) due to their extensive track record of service in Ethiopia, their geographic concentration within the nation, and their involvement in various sectors. These specific INGOs, (Action Against Hunger (ACF), Population Service International (PSI), Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), Jhpiego (Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics), and Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity) were chosen based on their significant experience in Ethiopia and their participation in diverse types of projects.

When selecting respondents, specific criteria were employed, including their years of professional experience, educational backgrounds, and current job positions. Respondents were divided into three categories based on their experience: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and over 10 years. They possessed a variety of qualifications, ranging from bachelor's degrees to PhDs, and held diverse roles such as program managers, program staff (non-managerial positions), finance managers, finance staff (non-managerial roles), MEAL (Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning) managers, and directors. This systematic approach aimed to gather perspectives from individuals spanning various organizational structures. Among the respondents, there were 26 bachelor's degree holders, 39 with master's degrees, and 2 with PhDs. In terms of current roles, 13 were Program Managers, 25 held program staff positions (non-managerial), 9 were

Finance Managers, 12 occupied finance staff roles (non-managerial), 6 were MEAL Managers, and 2 were Directors. Regarding experience, 38 respondents had 1 to 5 years of experience, 21 had 6 to 10 years of experience, and 8 had over 10 years of experience. Data collection employed a census sampling method, covering all 70 staff members involved in the projects of the selected INGOs. This methodology was viable because of the relatively modest size of the staff, guaranteeing thorough information collection for a robust comparison of organizational strategies. The research utilized a questionnaire comprising a mix of open-ended and closed-ended questions for data collection. By employing meticulous sampling and selection methodologies, the study sought to capture diverse perspectives from the designated INGOs and their staff, thereby offering valuable insights into how monitoring and evaluation systems affect organizational performance. This process involves choosing an adequate number of elements from a population, as described by Raval (2009). Flick (2007) defined a sampling frame as a comprehensive, current, and precise list of the population.

As per Williams (1997), it is necessary to choose a subset of elements from the population under study to enhance the manageability of the research.

The research selected five International non-governmental organizations (INGOs) based on their extensive service history in Ethiopia, their geographical coverage, and their involvement across multiple sectors (Action Against Hunger (ACF), Population Service International (PSI), Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), Jhpiego (Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics), and Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity) . These specific INGOs were chosen for their significant experience in Ethiopia and the diverse scope of their intervention programs. Respondents were chosen based on their experience, qualifications, and current roles, categorized into three groups: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and over 10 years of experience. Respondents possessed a range of qualifications from BA degrees to PhDs, and their positions encompassed program managers, non-managerial program staff, finance managers, non-managerial finance staff, meal managers, and directors. The selection method encompassed varied experience levels, educational backgrounds, and all facets of positions, extending beyond managerial roles. This approach aims to comprehensively assess respondents across different

hierarchical levels within the organization. Out of the total respondents, 26 hold a bachelor's degree, 39 hold a master's degree, and 2 PhD holder.

ACF has been operating in Ethiopia since 1985, offering support to refugees, internally displaced people, and communities in need. They work in various regions of Ethiopia, aiming to improve access to clean water, sanitation, and nutrition, as well as support farmers and herders affected by climate change. PSI Ethiopia, established in 2003, focuses on delivering healthcare interventions within both public and private domain. Their work spans HIV solutions and treatment, adolescent sexual and reproductive healthcare, prevention and screening for non-communicable diseases, and water, sanitation, and hygiene solutions.

ZOA is a global humanitarian and recovery organization that has been working in Ethiopia since 1998. They offer aid to individuals impacted by conflicts and natural calamities, both during the crisis and in their recovery. ZOA operates in various regions of Ethiopia, addressing areas such as water, sanitation and hygiene, shelter, education, food security, and livelihoods, and peacebuilding.

Jhpiego commenced its operations in Ethiopia in 2003., supporting the training of health officers in maternal and newborn care, as well as developing training programs for health extension workers. Fintrac, established in 1990, works with partners to enhance production, post-harvest handling, value addition, and market development for smallholder producers worldwide. Their The Ethiopia Value Chain Project has offered technical support services to over 371,000 smallholder producers in the past five years.

By examining the M&E practices of these international NGOs, the objective of this study is to identify challenges and areas for improvement. The findings will contribute to a better understanding of M&E practices in the context of development projects. It's important to note that there are two types of NGOs: Local and International NGOs. Local NGOs are civil society organizations formed under Ethiopian laws by Ethiopians, foreigner's resident in Ethiopia, or both. International NGOs are non-governmental organizations formed under legal statutes of foreign countries and registered to operate in Ethiopia as per "Proclamation No.1113/2019 Organization of Civil Societies.

The study is centered on evaluating Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices within international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) operating in Ethiopia, Five Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were chosen for this purpose, each with headquarters located in both the USA and Europe, contributing to a diverse respondent population.

Among these INGOs, Action Against Hunger (ACF) has been operational in Ethiopia since 1985, offering assistance to those in need, involving refugees and internally displaced persons. ACF operates in various regions, including Amhara, Benshangul Gumuz, Gambella, Oromia, Somali, Tigray, and the city administration of Addis Ababa. ACF's initiatives aim to enhance accessibility to clean water and secure sanitation, address malnutrition by saving lives, assist farmers and herders affected by climate change, and prevent hunger by empowering mothers with access to capital and knowledge about health and nutrition. ACF is headquartered in France.

Population Service International (PSI) is a network of organizations with local roots and global connections, collaborating to address various challenges towards achieving consumer-powered healthcare — prioritizing health systems centered around individuals to guarantee high quality and affordable care whenever and wherever needed. Founded in 2003, PSI Ethiopia employs insight marketing techniques to create, implement, and expand interventions throughout both the private and public sectors across the country PSI's initiatives encompass HIV solutions and treatment,

sexual and reproductive healthcare for adolescents, prevention and screening for non-communicable diseases, and water, sanitation, and hygiene solutions — all aimed at the common goal of strengthening Ethiopia's health markets to provide consumers with life-saving health services and products. PSI is headquartered in the USA, in Washington DC.

The Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) is a global humanitarian organization committed to offering aid to individuals impacted by violent conflicts and natural disasters in vulnerable settings. ZOA not only offers relief during crises but also assists in the recovery process afterward. Active in Ethiopia since 1998, ZOA has a presence in various regions, including Amhara (field offices in Woldia and Bahir Dar), Gambella (field office located in Gambella

Town), Oromia (field office in Harar), Somali (field office in Melkadida refugee camp and Jijiga), Tigray Regional State (field offices in Shire and Mekelle), and two city administrations (Addis Ababa and Dire Dawa). ZOA's work encompasses areas such as water, sanitation, and hygiene; shelter; education; food security and livelihoods; and peacebuilding. The ZOA headquarters is located in the Netherlands.

Jhpiego, the Johns Hopkins Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics, commenced operations in Ethiopia in 2003. Since then, Jhpiego's presence in Ethiopia has expanded and diversified. Jhpiego played a crucial role in supporting the training of health officers in maternal and newborn care. Additionally, they led the development of safe and clean delivery training for health extension workers (HEWs) aimed at providing essential maternal and newborn care in the four most populous regions of the country, namely Amhara, Tigray, Oromia, and the Southern Nations and Nationalities Peoples' Region (SNNPR).

Established in 1990, Fintrac (Feed the Future Value Chain Activity) has collaborated with in-country and international partners to enhance production, improve postharvest handling, add value, and develop markets and competitive value chains for smallholders worldwide. Over the past five years, the Ethiopia Value Chain Activity, a part of Fintrac, has provided technical support services to over 371,000 smallholder producers.

In terms of experience, 38 respondents have accumulated 1 to 5 years of expertise, 21 respondents have a professional background ranging from 6 to 10 years, and 8 respondents bring forth over 10 years of experience.

The study employs a census sampling method, encompassing all 70 staff members engaged in the projects. This method is chosen due to the relatively small size of the target population. The census approach is adopted to comprehensively assess the impact of monitoring and evaluation systems on organizational performance. It is deemed appropriate given the manageable size of the study population, allowing for the collection of all pertinent data necessary for a thorough

comparison of organizational strategies. In this study, a questionnaire featuring both open-ended and closed-ended questions is considered the most suitable tool for data collection.

### **3.5, Data collection method**

Utilizing survey methodologies, the tool employs standardized questions administered to groups or individuals, enabling the examination, comparison, and differentiation of findings (Trochim, 2006). This study employs both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data is collected through questionnaires, while secondary data is drawn from existing documents such as manuals, brochures, and survey reports.

### **3.6, Data Analysis**

This process entails the structured gathering, modeling, and refining of data to highlight pertinent information, suggest conclusions, and assist in decision-making (Sharma, 2005). Data condensation will be achieved through the utilization of structural coding and thematic analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized for analyzing the results. Descriptive statistics, including measures such as mean, percentage, standard deviation, and frequency, were employed to calculate totals, averages, and proportions within the dataset. Top of Form

### **3.7, Ethical Issues**

Ethical considerations are addressed during the data collection phase to mitigate any potential harm, suffering, or breaches. This includes obtaining consent before the research begins and maintaining the confidentiality of the collected data.

Throughout the research process, ethical principles regarding confidentiality and privacy are upheld. Respondents' identities remain undisclosed in the questionnaire, and prior informed consent is secured before conducting the survey. Participation in the study is entirely voluntary, with the researcher assuring respondents that their contributions will be treated confidentially and utilized solely for the purposes outlined in this study.

## Chapter Four

### Data Analysis and presentation

#### 4.1, Introduction

This chapter unveils the results derived from the analyzed survey data, interpreted in alignment with the study objectives. The findings are conveyed through the presentation of tables, graphs, and charts, illustrating frequencies and percentages.

#### 4.2, Questionnaire Response Rate

This chapter encapsulates the data derived from questionnaires and interviews, which were subsequently analyzed using Excel and SPSS. The survey instruments were administered to seventy employees from five distinct international NGOs directly involved in the M&E process. These organizations have a longstanding presence in Ethiopia. Out of the distributed questionnaires, sixty-seven were accurately completed and returned, resulting in a response rate of 95.71%, which is deemed acceptable.

Table 4.1. Response rate

Respond	In Number	percentage
Properly filled and returned	67	95.71%
Not returned	3	4.29%
Total	70	100%

Source: own source 2023

The questionnaires encompass both open-ended and closed-ended formats, with a scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - neutral, 4 - agree, and 5 - strongly agree). The data has been assessed and analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science), a widely employed tool in research. In addition to closed-ended questionnaires, open-ended interview questionnaires are also utilized, providing an opportunity for observation during face-

to-face interviews. These questionnaires are meticulously structured, requiring respondents to assign values within the specified range of 1 to 5 before returning them to the researcher.

### 4.3 General Information about the respondent

The participants in this research study exhibit diverse demographic characteristics, which are detailed in tables along with corresponding percentages. The demographic information encompasses factors such as gender, educational background, qualifications, job experience, and work experience related to Monitoring and Evaluation.

**Table 4.2: Gender**

Variables	Category	Respondent in no.	Percentage of respondent
	Female	23	34.3%
	Male	44	65.7%
	Total		

**Source: Own survey**

#### 1, Gender

From the analysis, it is evident that 23 respondents are female, constituting 34.3%, while 44 respondents are male, accounting for 66.7%. Most of the respondents were male at 66.7% as compared to 34.3%, who were female. This shows that there is inadequate genders representation in the study.

#### 2, Education

In terms of educational background, the respondents consist of 26 with a first degree, 39 with a master's degree, and 2 with a PhD. The majority of respondents hold master's degrees, 58.2%. This indicates that the respondents were highly educated.

**Table 4.3: Education**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	First degree	26	38.8	38.8	38.8
	Master's Degree	39	58.2	58.2	97.0
	PHD	2	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: Own survey**

### 3, Current position

The respondents hold various positions, encompassing Program Manager, Non-Program Manager, Finance Manager, Non-Finance Manager, MEAL Manager, and Directors. To provide a comprehensive overview, it's crucial to include all these positions in the analysis. Out of the respondents, 46 are affiliated with the Program Department, while the remaining 21 respondents belong to the Finance Department. This distribution indicates that 68.75% of the respondents are associated with the Program Department, whereas 31.3% are from the Finance Department. Therefore, it is right to conclude that the research has met the right group of target population.

**Table 4.4: Current position**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Program Manager	13	19.4	19.4	19.4
	program staff- non manager	25	37.3	37.3	56.7
	Finance Manager	9	13.4	13.4	70.1
	Finance staff- non manager	12	17.9	17.9	88.1
	Meal Manager	6	9.0	9.0	97.0
	Directors	2	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

### 4, Experience

In terms of experience, 38 respondents have less than 5 years of experience, 21 have between 6 to 10 years of experience, and the remaining 8 have more than 10 years of experience. This distribution corresponds to percentages of 56.7%, 31.3%, and 11.9%, respectively. This indicates that majority of the respondents experience were 10 years and below.

**Table 4.5: Experience**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than Five years	38	56.7	56.7	56.7
	between 6 and 10 years	21	31.3	31.3	88.1
	above 10 years	8	11.9	11.9	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

**4.4, presentation, analysis, and interpretation of Data**

**5, There is an M&E system in place within the organization?**

All the respondents confirmed that their organization has M&E system. The fact that all respondents confirmed their organization has a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system suggests that M&E practices are universally recognized and implemented across the surveyed organizations. This indicates a strong commitment to monitoring and evaluating projects, programs, or initiatives, reflecting an organizational culture that values accountability, performance measurement, and continuous improvement. The widespread presence of M&E systems may also imply that these organizations prioritize data-driven decision-making and are focused on achieving their objectives effectively.

**Table 4.6: There is an M&E system in place within the organization.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	67	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: own survey

## 6, There written guidelines for M&E within the organization

In the survey, 67 respondents provided information about the presence of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) written guidelines in their organizations. Out of these, 65 respondents confirmed that their organizations have established M&E written guidelines. This accounts for a substantial majority, representing 97% of the respondents. In contrast, only 2 respondents reported that their organizations do not have such guidelines, making up the remaining 3%.

This data indicates that nearly all organizations represented in the survey have implemented M&E written guidelines.

The survey results indicate that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) written guidelines are widely implemented across the organizations represented by the respondents. With 97% (65 out of 67) of the respondents confirming the presence of established M&E written guidelines, it is evident that the vast majority of organizations recognize the importance of having a formalized approach to M&E. This widespread adoption suggests a strong emphasis on standardizing M&E practices, ensuring consistency, and enhancing accountability within these organizations.

On the other hand, the 3% (2 out of 67) of respondents who reported the absence of M&E written guidelines highlight a potential gap in formalized M&E processes within a small fraction of organizations. This could point to areas where M&E practices might be less structured or where there may be room for improvement in formalizing M&E procedures.

Overall, the results reflect a robust commitment to M&E across most organizations, with a small minority that might benefit from developing or formalizing their M&E guidelines.

**Table 4.7: There is written guidelines for M&E within the organization**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	65	97.0	97.0	97.0
	No	2	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

## 7, There are Monitoring and Evaluation activities integrated into the project schedule

As per the survey results, it is indicated that Monitoring and Evaluation activities are incorporated into the project schedule, with 64 respondents in agreement and 3 respondents in disagreement. This corresponds to percentages of 95.5% and 4.5%, respectively. The survey results reveal that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities are integrated into the project schedules of most organizations, with 95.5% (64 out of 67) of respondents confirming this practice. This high percentage indicates that the vast majority of organizations prioritize M&E as a critical component of their project management processes. Incorporating M&E activities into the project schedule suggests a proactive approach to tracking progress, assessing outcomes, and making data-driven adjustments throughout the project lifecycle.

In contrast, the 4.5% (3 out of 67) of respondents disagreed that M&E activities are incorporated into their project schedules & this indicated that these organizations do not prioritize M&E within their project timelines. This small minority highlights an area where it needs improvement in aligning M&E activities with project planning and execution.

Overall, the results underscore a strong commitment to integrating M&E into project schedules among most organizations, reflecting the importance placed on continuous monitoring and evaluation to achieve project success.

**Table 4.8: There are Monitoring and Evaluation activities integrated into the project schedule.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	64	95.5	95.5	95.5
	No	3	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

## 8, Evaluation methods employed by your organization

The findings reveal that within the organization, 19 respondents utilize participatory evaluation, 26 employ Final Evaluation, 17 opt for internal evaluation, and 5 engage in external evaluation. The findings indicate a diverse approach to evaluation methods within the organization, reflecting the varying needs and preferences of different teams or projects:

1. **Participatory Evaluation (19 respondents):** A significant portion of respondents (19 out of 67) utilize participatory evaluation, suggesting a strong emphasis on involving stakeholders, including beneficiaries and project teams, in the evaluation process. This approach likely fosters a collaborative environment and ensures that multiple perspectives are considered when assessing project outcomes.
2. **Final Evaluation (26 respondents):** The most commonly used method, with 26 respondents, is the final evaluation, which typically occurs at the end of a project or program. This preference indicates that many within the organization prioritize comprehensive assessments that summarize the overall impact and effectiveness of a project, providing insights for future initiatives.
3. **Internal Evaluation (17 respondents):** Internal evaluation, used by 17 respondents, reflects a focus on conducting evaluations within the organization, possibly to maintain control over the evaluation process and leverage internal expertise. This approach offers greater flexibility and a deeper understanding of organizational context.
4. **External Evaluation (5 respondents):** The least utilized method, external evaluation, with only 5 respondents, suggests that fewer teams or projects rely on independent, third-party evaluations. While less common, external evaluations can provide an unbiased perspective and credibility to the findings, particularly for external stakeholders or donors.

Overall, the variety of evaluation methods employed indicates that the organization values different approaches depending on the specific goals, resources, and contexts of their projects. The preference for final and participatory evaluations suggests a balanced approach between assessing overall project impact and engaging stakeholders in the evaluation process.

**Table 4.9: Evaluation methods employed by your organization.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Participatory evaluation	19	28.4	28.4	28.4
	Final evaluation	26	38.8	38.8	67.2
	Internal evaluation	17	25.4	25.4	92.5
	External evaluation	5	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

## **9, The individual responsible for conducting M&E at the project site**

The results indicate that 5 respondents affirm monitoring and evaluation being conducted by Program Managers, 61 respondents confirm it being carried out by MEAL Managers, and 1 respondent confirms it being overseen by an Office Manager. The results highlight the distribution of responsibilities for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) within the organization, showing a clear preference for specialized roles in overseeing these activities:

- 1. MEAL Managers (61 respondents):** An overwhelming majority of respondents (61 out of 67) confirm that M&E is conducted by Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) Managers. This indicates that the organization heavily relies on dedicated M&E professionals who specialize in these activities, ensuring that M&E processes are systematically managed and aligned with best practices. The prominence of MEAL Managers in this role suggests that the organization values a structured and professional approach to M&E, likely leading to more rigorous and effective evaluations.
- 2. Program Managers (5 respondents):** A smaller group of respondents (5 out of 67) report that Program Managers are responsible for conducting M&E. This suggests that in some cases, M&E responsibilities are integrated into the broader program management role. While this approach offers the advantage of having M&E closely tied to program

implementation, it could also indicate that in these cases, M&E might be less specialized or rely on the program manager's capacity to balance multiple responsibilities.

3. **Office Manager (1 respondent):** Only 1 respondent indicates that M&E is overseen by an Office Manager. This is an outlier, suggesting that in this specific case, M&E is managed at an administrative level rather than by a specialized M&E professional or program manager. This could reflect a smaller or less resource-intensive program where M&E is not as heavily emphasized, or where roles are more generalized.

Overall, the results underscore the organization’s strong reliance on MEAL Managers for M&E activities, reinforcing the importance of having dedicated experts to handle these critical functions. The minority of cases where Program or Office Managers are responsible for M&E may indicate variations in how different projects or teams approach the integration of M&E with their broader responsibilities.

**Table 4.10: The individual responsible for conducting M&E at the project site**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Project Manager	5	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Meal Manager	61	91.0	91.0	98.5
	Office Manager	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own Survey**

### **10, To whom is the Monitoring and Evaluation provided?**

Regarding the dissemination of M&E information, 21 respondents (31.3%) affirm that the information is provided to the management, 34 respondents (50.7%) confirm its provision to stakeholders, 3 respondents (4.5%) indicate that M&E information is shared with the government, and 9 respondents (13.4%) confirm its provision to donors. The results provide insights into how Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) information is disseminated within and outside the organization, highlighting the varying priorities in sharing these insights with different groups:

1. **Stakeholders (34 respondents, 50.7%)**: The largest group of respondents indicates that M&E information is shared with stakeholders. This suggests that the organization prioritizes transparency and communication with those directly involved or affected by the projects, such as community members, partners, and other relevant parties. Sharing M&E information with stakeholders can enhance trust, foster collaboration, and ensure that the findings are used to inform future actions.
2. **Management (21 respondents, 31.3%)**: A significant portion of respondents confirm that M&E information is provided to management. This indicates that the organization values using M&E data for decision-making at the leadership level. By sharing these insights with management, the organization ensures that strategic decisions are informed by accurate, data-driven evaluations, which can lead to better resource allocation and more effective project outcomes.
3. **Donors (9 respondents, 13.4%)**: M&E information is shared with donors by a smaller group of respondents. This suggests that while donors are an important audience, they are not the primary focus of M&E dissemination efforts. Providing M&E data to donors is crucial for accountability and securing continued funding, but the lower percentage indicates that this may be done selectively as needed, rather than as a routine practice.
4. **Government (3 respondents, 4.5%)**: The smallest group of respondents reports that M&E information is shared with the government. This could indicate that the organization's projects are either not heavily government-regulated, or that government agencies are not the primary audience for M&E findings. However, in contexts where government involvement is crucial, this might point to a potential area for increased engagement to align with regulatory requirements or contribute to broader policy discussions.

Overall, the results suggest that the organization places the greatest emphasis on sharing M&E information with stakeholders and management, reflecting a focus on ensuring that both those directly involved in the projects and those making strategic decisions are well-informed. The lower percentages for sharing with donors and the government may indicate that these are secondary priorities, or that sharing with these groups is done more selectively.

**Table 4.11: To whom is the Monitoring and Evaluation provided?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	To the management	21	31.3	31.3	31.3
	To stakeholders and owners of the project	34	50.7	50.7	82.1
	To Government	3	4.5	4.5	86.6
	To Donors	9	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

## **11, The method employed for data collection**

In terms of data collection techniques, 33 respondents (49.3%) agree that data is collected through questionnaires, 22 respondents (32.8%) state that data is collected through interviews, 7 respondents (10.4%) confirm data collection through observation, and 5 respondents (7.5%) indicate the use of case studies. The predominant method, as confirmed by 49.3% of respondents, is data collection through questionnaires. The results provide an overview of the preferred data collection techniques within the organization, highlighting a range of methods used to gather information for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) purposes:

1. **Questionnaires (33 respondents, 49.3%):** Nearly half of the respondents (49.3%) confirm that data is collected primarily through questionnaires. This indicates that questionnaires are the most widely used method for gathering data. The popularity of this technique suggests that it is valued for its ability to efficiently collect standardized information from a large number of respondents. Questionnaires are likely preferred for their scalability, ease of administration, and ability to generate quantitative data that can be easily analyzed.
2. **Interviews (22 respondents, 32.8%):** A significant portion of respondents (32.8%) state that data is collected through interviews. This method is often used when more in-depth, qualitative insights are needed. The use of interviews suggests that the organization also

values capturing detailed, nuanced perspectives that might not be fully captured through questionnaires. Interviews allow for open-ended responses and follow-up questions, providing richer data that can help explain or contextualize findings from other methods.

3. **Observation (7 respondents, 10.4%):** A smaller group of respondents (10.4%) confirm the use of observation as a data collection technique. Observation is typically used to gather data in real-time, capturing behaviors, processes, or events as they naturally occur. The use of this method indicates that in some cases, the organization places importance on direct, first-hand data collection, which can be particularly valuable in assessing program implementation or outcomes that are best understood through direct observation.
4. **Case Studies (5 respondents, 7.5%):** The least commonly used method, according to 7.5% of respondents, is the case study approach. Case studies are often used to conduct in-depth analyses of specific instances or examples, providing detailed insights into particular aspects of a program or project. The lower use of this method suggests that while it is valuable for understanding complex issues in depth, it may be reserved for specific situations where a detailed, holistic understanding is necessary.

Overall, the results indicate that while questionnaires are the predominant method for data collection, there is also a significant reliance on interviews to gather qualitative insights. The use of observation and case studies, though less common, reflects the organization's appreciation for a variety of data collection techniques tailored to different contexts and needs. The diversity of methods used suggests a balanced approach, combining the strengths of quantitative and qualitative data to inform Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

**Table 4.12: The method employed for data collection**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Questionnaire	33	49.3	49.3	49.3
	Interview	22	32.8	32.8	82.1
	Observation	7	10.4	10.4	92.5
	Case study	5	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

source own survey

## **12, Sufficient budget allocation is made by the organization at the project's outset.**

The majority of respondents, accounting for 83.6%, express agreement that the organization allocates a budget for M&E during the proposal stage. On the contrary, 9% of respondents disagree with the allocation of budget for M&E at the initial stage. The results indicate a strong consensus within the organization regarding the allocation of a budget for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) during the proposal stage:

1. **Agreement on Budget Allocation (83.6%):** The overwhelming majority of respondents (83.6%) agree that the organization allocates a budget for M&E at the proposal stage. This suggests that M&E is considered an integral part of project planning from the very beginning. The early allocation of a budget for M&E reflects the organization's commitment to ensuring that sufficient resources are dedicated to monitoring and evaluating project outcomes, which is crucial for accountability, learning, and continuous improvement.
2. **Disagreement on Budget Allocation (9%):** A smaller group of respondents (9%) disagree with the statement that a budget for M&E is allocated during the proposal stage. This minority view could indicate that in some cases, M&E is under-prioritized. This could also suggest that there are inconsistencies in how M&E budgeting is handled across different projects or teams within the organization.

Overall, the results reflect a strong organizational focus on incorporating M&E into the project planning process, with the majority of respondents acknowledging the importance of securing financial resources for these activities early on. The small percentage of disagreement highlights a potential area for improvement, where the organization could work towards ensuring that all projects consistently allocate a budget for M&E during the proposal stage, reinforcing its commitment to effective monitoring and evaluation practices.

**Table 4.13: Sufficient budget allocation is made by the organization at the project's outset**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	3	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Disagree	3	4.5	4.5	9.0
	Neutral	5	7.5	7.5	16.4
	Agree	30	44.8	44.8	61.2
	strongly agree	26	38.8	38.8	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

### **13, M&E planning processes are incorporated into the project plans.**

The analysis results reveal that 57 respondents agree that the project plan incorporates the M&E planning process, while 3 respondents disagree, and 7 respondents remain neutral. The analysis results provide insights into how the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) planning process is integrated into project planning:

1. **Agreement on M&E Integration (57 respondents):** A majority of respondents (57 out of 67) agree that the project plan includes the M&E planning process. This indicates that most projects within the organization effectively integrate M&E considerations into their overall planning. Incorporating M&E planning into project development ensures that there are clear mechanisms for tracking progress, assessing outcomes, and making data-driven decisions, which contributes to the effectiveness and accountability of the projects.
2. **Disagreement on M&E Integration (3 respondents):** A small number of respondents (3 out of 67) disagree that the M&E planning process is incorporated into the project plan. This suggests that in these cases, the M&E aspects may not be adequately addressed during project planning, which could potentially impact the ability to effectively monitor and evaluate project outcomes.
3. **Neutral Responses (7 respondents):** The 7 respondents who remain neutral, not fully aware of how M&E is integrated into the project planning process. This neutrality could

reflect a lack of clarity or communication about the role of M&E in project plans, or it might indicate variability in how different projects approach M&E planning.

Overall, the results highlight that most projects within the organization successfully incorporate M&E planning into their project plans, demonstrating a strong commitment to systematic monitoring and evaluation. The small percentage of disagreement and neutral responses points to potential areas where the integration of M&E into project planning could be improved or better communicated.

**Table 4.14: M&E planning processes are incorporated into the project plans.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	2	3.0	3.0	4.5
	Neutra	7	10.4	10.4	14.9
	Agree	30	44.8	44.8	59.7
	Strongly agree	27	40.3	40.3	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

#### **14, The organization ensures that all staff members understand the significance of M&E.**

Regarding the communication of the importance of M&E to all staff, 47 respondents (70.2%) express agreement, 10 respondents (14.9%) disagree, and 10 respondents (14.9%) remain neutral. The results provide a snapshot of how effectively the importance of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is communicated to staff within the organization:

- 1. Agreement on Communication (47 respondents, 70.2%):** A significant majority of respondents (70.2%) agree that the importance of M&E is communicated to all staff. This suggests that a substantial portion of the organization recognizes and effectively conveys the value of M&E practices to its employees. Effective communication about M&E is crucial for ensuring that all staff understand its significance, which can enhance their

engagement with M&E activities and contribute to a culture of accountability and continuous improvement.

2. **Disagreement on Communication (10 respondents, 14.9%):** A smaller group of respondents (14.9%) disagree with the statement, indicating that they do not believe the importance of M&E is adequately communicated to all staff. This could imply gaps in how the organization disseminates information about M&E, or it may reflect inconsistencies in communication practices across different teams or departments.
3. **Neutral Responses (10 respondents, 14.9%):** The 14.9% of respondents who remain neutral, uncertain about the extent to which the importance of M&E is communicated or may not have sufficient information to form a strong opinion. This neutrality could indicate a lack of clarity or varying experiences with how M&E is discussed within the organization.

Overall, the results indicate that while a majority of respondents feel that the importance of M&E is well communicated, there is still room for improvement. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and engaging the neutral respondents could further strengthen the organization’s commitment to M&E and ensure that all staff are informed and aligned with M&E objectives.

**Table 4.15: The organization ensures that all staff members understand the significance of M&E.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	2	3.0	3.0	3.0
	disagree	8	11.9	11.9	14.9
	Neutral	10	14.9	14.9	29.9
	Agree	27	40.3	40.3	70.1
	strongly agree	20	29.9	29.9	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

## **15, The clarity regarding the scope and purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation is evident.**

The findings indicate that 45 respondents agree that the scope and purpose of the M&E system are clear, while 9 respondents disagree, and 13 respondents are neutral. The findings provide insights into the clarity of the scope and purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system within the organization:

1. **Agreement on Clarity (45 respondents):** A majority of respondents (45 out of 67) agree that the scope and purpose of the M&E system are clear. This indicates that a significant portion of the organization has a good understanding of the M&E system's objectives and functions. Clear communication of the scope and purpose of the M&E system is crucial for ensuring that all stakeholders are aligned with its goals and can effectively engage with its processes.
2. **Disagreement on Clarity (9 respondents):** A smaller group of respondents (9 out of 67) disagree, suggesting that they find the scope and purpose of the M&E system to be unclear. This could point to issues such as insufficient communication, lack of detailed information, or confusion about how the M&E system fits into the overall organizational framework.
3. **Neutral Responses (13 respondents):** The 13 respondents who are neutral, unsure or indifferent about the clarity of the M&E system's scope and purpose. This neutrality might reflect a lack of engagement with the M&E system or uncertainty about its relevance and objectives.

Overall, the results suggest that most respondents have a clear understanding of the M&E system's scope and purpose, which is positive for effective implementation and utilization. However, there is a need to address the concerns of those who find it unclear and to engage the neutral respondents more effectively. Improving communication and providing additional information could help ensure that all stakeholders have a clear and shared understanding of the M&E system.

**Table 4.16: The clarity regarding the scope and purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation is evident.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	9	13.4	13.4	13.4
	Neutral	13	19.4	19.4	32.8
	Agree	27	40.3	40.3	73.1
	strongly agree	18	26.9	26.9	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

### **16, The organization assesses planned activities against the realized ones.**

The results indicate that 32 respondents agree that the organization compares planned project activities against actual outcomes for M&E, while 26 respondents disagree, and 9 respondents remain neutral. The results reveal varied opinions on whether the organization compares planned project activities against actual outcomes for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E):

1. **Agreement on Comparison (32 respondents):** A significant portion of respondents (32 out of 67) agree that the organization compares planned project activities with actual outcomes. This suggests that a substantial number of respondents believe that the organization actively engages in assessing how well project implementation aligns with initial plans. This comparison is a critical component of M&E, as it helps identify deviations, assess performance, and make necessary adjustments to improve project outcomes.
2. **Disagreement on Comparison (26 respondents):** A notable number of respondents (26 out of 67) disagree that such comparisons are made. This indicates that there may be concerns or issues regarding how effectively the organization tracks and evaluates the alignment between planned activities and actual results. Disagreement in this area suggest gaps in the M&E process, potential inefficiencies, or a lack of consistent practices in evaluating project performance.
3. **Neutral Responses (9 respondents):** The 9 respondents who remain neutral may be unsure about the organization’s practices related to comparing planned activities with

actual outcomes. This neutrality could reflect a lack of visibility into or involvement with the M&E process, or it may indicate that respondents are not well-informed about the organization’s approach to this aspect of evaluation.

Overall, while a significant portion of respondents recognizes the practice of comparing planned activities with actual outcomes as part of M&E, there is a considerable minority who do not see this as a consistent practice. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and engaging with neutral respondents could help strengthen the organization’s M&E processes and ensure more effective performance evaluation.

**Table 4.17: , The organization assesses planned activities against the realized ones.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Neutral	9	13.4	13.4	20.9
	Agree	32	47.8	47.8	68.7
	strongly disagree	21	31.3	31.3	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

**17, Is the planning process adequately detailed?**

The findings reveal that 9 respondents disagree with the assertion that the planning process is well-detailed, while 50 respondents agree, and 8 respondents remain neutral. The findings provide insight into perceptions of the thoroughness and detail of the planning process within the organization:

1. **Agreement on Detailed Planning (50 respondents):** A majority of respondents (50 out of 67) agree that the planning process is well-detailed. This indicates that most individuals within the organization believe that the planning process is comprehensive and thorough, suggesting that the organization invests significant effort in creating detailed plans. Detailed planning is essential for setting clear objectives, defining processes, and ensuring that all aspects of a project or initiative are well-considered.

2. **Disagreement on Detailed Planning (9 respondents):** A smaller group of respondents (9 out of 67) disagree with the assertion that the planning process is well-detailed. This could imply that these respondents perceive gaps or deficiencies in the planning process. Their disagreement might reflect issues such as insufficient detail in planning documents, lack of clarity in project objectives, or inadequate consideration of potential challenges and resources.
3. **Neutral Responses (8 respondents):** The 8 respondents who remain neutral may be uncertain about the level of detail in the planning process or may not have sufficient information to form a strong opinion. This neutrality could indicate a lack of involvement or visibility into the planning process or a perception that the level of detail is adequate but not particularly noteworthy.

Overall, the results suggest that while the majority of respondents view the planning process as well-detailed, there is a notable minority who feel that the planning process could be improved. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and seeking feedback from neutral respondents could help enhance the planning process, ensuring it meets the needs of all stakeholders and supports effective project implementation.

**Table 4.18: Is the planning process adequately detailed?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	8	11.9	11.9	13.4
	Neutral	8	11.9	11.9	25.4
	Agree	33	49.3	49.3	74.6
	strongly agree	17	25.4	25.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

## **18, The organization provide M&E training to its staff**

According to the results, 43 respondents (64.2%) agree that the organization provides M&E training for the staff, 11 respondents (16.4%) disagree, and 13 respondents (19.4%) remain neutral. The results provide a view of how the organization approaches M&E training for its staff:

1. **Agreement on M&E Training (43 respondents, 64.2%):** A majority of respondents (64.2%) agree that the organization provides M&E training for staff. This indicates that a significant portion of the organization's workforce has access to training related to Monitoring and Evaluation. Providing such training is essential for equipping staff with the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively engage in M&E activities, thereby enhancing the overall effectiveness of the M&E system and promoting a culture of learning and continuous improvement.
2. **Disagreement on M&E Training (11 respondents, 16.4%):** A smaller group of respondents (16.4%) disagree that M&E training is provided. This suggests that these respondents believe that the organization either does not offer sufficient M&E training or that such training is not adequately communicated or accessible to all staff. This disagreement indicate gaps in training programs or differences in the availability or quality of training across different teams or departments.
3. **Neutral Responses (13 respondents, 19.4%):** The 19.4% of respondents who are neutral may be unsure about the availability or effectiveness of M&E training within the organization. This neutrality could reflect a lack of direct experience with the training programs or insufficient information about their existence and scope.

Overall, the results suggest that while a majority of respondents acknowledge the provision of M&E training, there is a noticeable minority who either do not see this as a practice or have concerns about its implementation. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and providing more information to neutral respondents could help ensure that M&E training is effectively delivered and that all staff are adequately prepared to participate in M&E activities.

**Table 4.19: The organization provide M&E training to its staff**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	2	3.0	3.0	3.0
	disagree	9	13.4	13.4	16.4
	Neutral	13	19.4	19.4	35.8
	Agree	29	43.3	43.3	79.1
	strongly agree	14	20.9	20.9	100.0
	Total		67	100.0	100.0

Source: own survey

## **19, The planning process aid decision-making during project implementation**

The results indicate that 53 respondents agree that the M&E planning process supports decision-making during project implementation, while 5 respondents disagree, and 9 respondents remain neutral. The results provide insight into how well the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) planning process supports decision-making during project implementation:

- 1. Agreement on Support for Decision-Making (53 respondents):** A significant majority of respondents (53 out of 67) agree that the M&E planning process effectively supports decision-making during project implementation. This suggests that most respondents believe that the M&E process provides valuable insights and data that help guide project decisions. Effective M&E planning is crucial for making informed adjustments, addressing issues as they arise, and ensuring that projects remain aligned with their objectives.
- 2. Disagreement on Support for Decision-Making (5 respondents):** A smaller group of respondents (5 out of 67) disagree with the assertion that the M&E planning process supports decision-making. This indicates that these individuals may feel that the M&E process does not adequately inform or influence project decisions. Their disagreement could point to potential issues such as insufficient integration of M&E data into decision-

making processes, lack of timely reporting, or challenges in interpreting the data effectively.

3. **Neutral Responses (9 respondents):** The 9 respondents who remain neutral may be uncertain about the impact of M&E planning on decision-making or may not have enough information to form a definitive opinion. This neutrality could suggest a lack of direct involvement with the M&E process or a need for better communication about how M&E data is used in decision-making.

Overall, the results indicate that the majority of respondents view the M&E planning process as a valuable tool for supporting decision-making during project implementation. However, the small percentage of disagreement and neutral responses highlights areas where there may be room for improvement. Ensuring that M&E findings are effectively integrated into decision-making processes and improving communication about the role of M&E can help enhance its impact on project outcomes.

**Table 4.20: The planning process aid decision-making during project implementation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	5	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Neutral	9	13.4	13.4	20.9
	Agree	35	52.2	52.2	73.1
	strongly agree	18	26.9	26.9	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

## **20, Th project staff trained to develop their technical capacity in M&E**

The result reveals that 14 respondents, constituting 20.90%, disagree, indicating that project staff lack training in the technical capacity of M&E. On the other hand, 35 respondents, accounting for 52.3%, agree, while the remaining 26.9%, represented by 18 respondents, remain neutral. The results provide a view of staff perceptions regarding the level of training in the technical capacity of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E):

1. **Disagreement on Training (14 respondents, 20.9%):** A notable portion of respondents (20.9%) disagree, indicating that they believe project staff lack training in the technical aspects of M&E. This suggests that these individuals perceive a gap in the technical training provided to staff, which could impact their ability to effectively engage in M&E activities. Insufficient technical training can lead to challenges in implementing M&E systems, analyzing data, and using M&E findings to inform project decisions.
2. **Agreement on Training (35 respondents, 52.3%):** More than half of the respondents (52.3%) agree that project staff receive adequate training in the technical aspects of M&E. This indicates that a majority believe that the organization provides sufficient training to ensure staff are well-equipped to handle M&E tasks. Effective technical training is crucial for ensuring that staff have the skills and knowledge needed to perform M&E functions effectively and to contribute to the overall success of the M&E system.
3. **Neutral Responses (18 respondents, 26.9%):** A significant portion of respondents (26.9%) remain neutral on this issue, suggesting they may be unsure about the adequacy of technical training in M&E or may not have enough information to form a clear opinion. This neutrality could reflect a lack of direct experience with the training programs or variability in training quality across different teams or projects.

Overall, the results indicate a mixed perception of technical training in M&E. While a majority of respondents believe that staff receive adequate training, a substantial minority perceive a gap in technical capacity. The presence of neutral responses suggests that there may be inconsistencies or a need for clearer communication about the training provided. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and engaging with neutral respondents can help improve the training program and ensure that all staff are well-prepared to perform M&E functions effectively.

**Table 4.21: The project staff trained to develop their technical capacity in M&E**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	3	4.5	4.5	4.5
	disagree	11	16.4	16.4	20.9
	Neutral	18	26.9	26.9	47.8
	Agree	29	43.3	43.3	91.0
	Strongly agree	6	9.0	9.0	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

## 21, Sufficient budgets allocated for Monitoring and Evaluation

According to the results, 14 respondents (20.9%) express disagreement, 41 respondents (61.2%) affirm that adequate budgets are allocated for M&E, and 12 respondents (17.9%) remain neutral. The results reflect perceptions of budget allocation for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) within the organization:

1. **Agreement on Budget Allocation (41 respondents, 61.2%):** A majority of respondents (61.2%) affirm that adequate budgets are allocated for M&E. This suggests that most individuals believe that the organization allocates sufficient financial resources to support M&E activities. Adequate budgeting for M&E is essential for ensuring that necessary resources are available for effective monitoring, evaluation, and reporting, which in turn supports the successful implementation and impact assessment of projects.
2. **Disagreement on Budget Allocation (14 respondents, 20.9%):** A significant minority of respondents (20.9%) disagree, indicating that they believe the organization does not allocate enough budget for M&E. This suggests that these individuals perceive a shortfall in financial resources dedicated to M&E, which could hinder the ability to conduct thorough evaluations, collect and analyze data, and address any issues that arise during project implementation.

3. **Neutral Responses (12 respondents, 17.9%):** The remaining 17.9% of respondents are neutral, which indicates they may be unsure about the adequacy of the M&E budget or do not have enough information to form a clear opinion. This neutrality could reflect a lack of direct insight into budgetary decisions or variability in how budget allocations are perceived across different departments or projects.

Overall, the results indicate that a majority of respondents are satisfied with the M&E budget allocation, suggesting that, for them, the financial resources are adequate. However, the significant minority who disagree points to potential concerns about underfunding, and the neutral responses highlight the need for clearer communication or additional information about M&E budgeting. Addressing these concerns and improving transparency about budget allocation could help ensure that all stakeholders have a clear understanding of how M&E resources are allocated and used.

**Table 4.22: Sufficient budgets allocated for Monitoring and Evaluation?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	disagree	13	19.4	19.4	20.9
	Neutral	12	17.9	17.9	38.8
	Agree	32	47.8	47.8	86.6
	strongly agree	9	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

## **22, M&E information is utilized to aid in managerial decision-making and planning.**

The findings indicate that 6 respondents (9%) assert that M&E is not utilized to support managerial decision-making and planning, 7 respondents (10.4%) remain neutral, and 54 respondents (80.6%) affirm that M&E information is indeed used to support managerial decision-making and planning. The findings shed light on the role of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in supporting managerial decision-making and planning:

1. **Agreement on M&E Utilization (54 respondents, 80.6%):** A substantial majority of respondents (80.6%) affirm that M&E information is used to support managerial decision-making and planning. This indicates that most respondents believe M&E data and insights are effectively integrated into the organization's decision-making processes. Utilizing M&E information in this way is crucial for making informed decisions, adjusting strategies, and planning future activities based on empirical evidence and performance assessments.
2. **Disagreement on M&E Utilization (6 respondents, 9%):** A smaller group of respondents (9%) assert that M&E is not utilized to support managerial decision-making and planning. This suggests that these individuals feel that M&E information is not effectively used or integrated into decision-making processes. Their views might indicate issues such as insufficient use of M&E data, lack of mechanisms for incorporating findings into planning, or challenges in translating M&E results into actionable insights.
3. **Neutral Responses (7 respondents, 10.4%):** The 10.4% of respondents who remain neutral may be uncertain about the extent to which M&E is used for decision-making or may not have enough information to form a definitive opinion. This neutrality could reflect a lack of direct experience with how M&E information is utilized or variability in practices across different departments or projects.

Overall, the results suggest that the majority of respondents view M&E as a valuable tool for supporting managerial decision-making and planning, highlighting its importance in guiding strategic decisions and improving organizational effectiveness. However, the minority who disagree and the neutral responses point to potential areas where the use of M&E information could be enhanced or more effectively communicated. Addressing these concerns and ensuring consistent application of M&E insights in decision-making can help maximize the value of M&E efforts within the organization.

**Table 4.23: M&E information is utilized to aid in managerial decision-making and planning.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5

Disagree	5	7.5	7.5	9.0
Neutral	7	10.4	10.4	19.4
Agree	35	52.2	52.2	71.6
strongly agree	19	28.4	28.4	100.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

### **23, The organization dedicates ample time and establishes a schedule for monitoring and evaluation.**

Regarding the allocation of adequate time and a set schedule for M&E, 13 respondents (19.4%) express disagreement, 11 respondents (16.4%) remain neutral, and 43 respondents (64.2%) agree that there is sufficient time and a designated schedule for M&E. The results provide insights into perceptions about the allocation of time and scheduling for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) within the organization:

- 1. Agreement on Time and Scheduling (43 respondents, 64.2%):** A majority of respondents (64.2%) agree that there is adequate time and a designated schedule for M&E activities. This indicates that most individuals feel that the organization allocates sufficient time and has a structured schedule for conducting M&E tasks. Proper time allocation and scheduling are essential for ensuring that M&E activities are carried out effectively, allowing for thorough data collection, analysis, and reporting.
- 2. Disagreement on Time and Scheduling (13 respondents, 19.4%):** A significant portion of respondents (19.4%) express disagreement, suggesting that they believe there is insufficient time or a lack of proper scheduling for M&E activities. This could indicate challenges such as rushed timelines, inadequate planning for M&E tasks, or competing priorities that may impact the effective execution of M&E activities.
- 3. Neutral Responses (11 respondents, 16.4%):** The 16.4% of respondents who remain neutral may be unsure about the adequacy of time and scheduling for M&E or may not have enough information to form a clear opinion. Their neutrality could reflect variability in experiences or perceptions regarding how time and schedules are managed for M&E within different projects or departments.

Overall, the results suggest that while a majority of respondents feel that time and scheduling for M&E are well-managed, there is a notable minority who perceive issues in this area. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and engaging with neutral respondents can help improve the planning and execution of M&E activities, ensuring that sufficient time and resources are allocated to support effective monitoring and evaluation.

**Table 24: The organization dedicates ample time and establishes a schedule for monitoring and evaluation.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	13	19.4	19.4	19.4
	Neutral	11	16.4	16.4	35.8
	agree	30	44.8	44.8	80.6
	strongly agree	13	19.4	19.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

#### **24, Capable and skilled staff members handle M&E tasks.**

The findings indicate that 6 respondents expressing competence disagree that the staff conducting M&E are competent, 10 respondents remain neutral, and 51 respondents agree that competent and skilled staff are involved in conducting M&E. The findings offer a perspective on the perceived competence of staff involved in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E):

1. **Agreement on Staff Competence (51 respondents):** A strong majority of respondents (51 out of 67, or 76.1%) agree that the staff conducting M&E are competent and skilled. This indicates that most individuals believe the M&E team has the necessary expertise and qualifications to effectively carry out their responsibilities. Competent staff are crucial for ensuring high-quality M&E processes, accurate data collection, and meaningful analysis, which in turn support informed decision-making and successful project outcomes.
2. **Disagreement on Staff Competence (6 respondents):** A smaller group of respondents (6 out of 67, or 9%) disagree, suggesting they do not believe the staff involved in M&E

are sufficiently competent. This could point to concerns about the skills or training of the M&E team, which might affect the overall effectiveness of the M&E activities. Addressing these concerns involve additional training, support, or reassessment of the team’s qualifications.

3. **Neutral Responses (10 respondents):** The 10 respondents who are neutral might be uncertain about the competence of the M&E staff or may not have enough information to assess their skills. This neutrality could indicate a lack of direct involvement with or insight into the M&E team's performance.

Overall, the results suggest that while a significant majority view the M&E staff as competent and skilled, there is a minority who question their expertise. Ensuring that concerns about staff competence are addressed and providing additional support or training as needed can help enhance the effectiveness of the M&E function and improve overall confidence in its processes.

**Table 4.25: Capable and skilled staff members handle M&E tasks.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	5	7.5	7.5	9.0
	Neutral	10	14.9	14.9	23.9
	Agree	34	50.7	50.7	74.6
	strongly agree	17	25.4	25.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey

## 25, The organization's Senior Management Team emphasizes M&E practices

The senior management team's attention to M&E practice is reflected in the results, with 11 respondents disagreeing, 8 respondents remaining neutral, and 48 respondents agreeing. The results indicate perceptions of how much attention the senior management team pays to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices:

1. **Agreement on Management Attention (48 respondents, 71.6%):** A majority of respondents (48 out of 67) agree that the senior management team pays significant

attention to M&E practices. This suggests that most individuals believe senior management is actively engaged with and supports M&E activities. Attention from senior management is crucial for ensuring that M&E practices are prioritized, adequately resourced, and effectively integrated into the organization’s overall strategy.

2. **Disagreement on Management Attention (11 respondents, 16.4%):** A smaller group of respondents (11 out of 67) disagree, indicating they feel that senior management does not adequately focus on or support M&E practices. This might reflect concerns about the visibility of M&E within the organization, a lack of strategic support, or insufficient involvement from senior leaders in M&E activities. Such gaps could impact the effectiveness and prioritization of M&E efforts.
3. **Neutral Responses (8 respondents, 11.9%):** The 8 respondents who remain neutral may be unsure about the level of attention senior management pays to M&E or may not have enough information to form a clear opinion. Their neutrality could suggest variability in experiences or a lack of direct insight into how senior management engages with M&E practices.

Overall, the results suggest that a significant majority of respondents perceive senior management as attentive and supportive of M&E practices. However, the concerns of those who disagree, and the neutral responses indicate that there may be areas where engagement and support from senior management could be improved or more clearly communicated. Addressing these concerns can help reinforce the importance of M&E within the organization and ensure its effective implementation.

**Table 4.26: The organization's Senior Management Team emphasizes M&E practices**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	10	14.9	14.9	16.4
	Neutral	8	11.9	11.9	28.4
	Agree	29	43.3	43.3	71.6
	Strongly Disagree	19	28.4	28.4	100.0

Total	67	100.0	100.0
-------	----	-------	-------

Source: own Survey

## **26, The executive considers the M&E appraisal/valuation report.**

According to the results, 9 respondents express disagreement regarding whether the executive takes into consideration the M&E evaluation report. Additionally, 14 respondents remain neutral, while 44 respondents affirm that the management indeed considers the M&E evaluation. The results provide insights into whether the executive management takes the M&E evaluation reports into consideration:

1. **Agreement on Consideration of M&E Reports (44 respondents, 65.7%):** A majority of respondents (44 out of 67) affirm that executive management does consider M&E evaluation reports. This suggests that most individuals believe that the findings and recommendations from M&E reports are reviewed and taken into account by top-level management. This practice is important for ensuring that M&E insights influence strategic decision-making and contribute to organizational improvements.
2. **Disagreement on Consideration of M&E Reports (9 respondents, 13.4%):** A smaller group of respondents (9 out of 67) disagree, indicating they believe that executive management does not adequately consider M&E evaluation reports. This could reflect concerns about the visibility or impact of M&E findings at the executive level, potentially suggesting that reports may not be sufficiently integrated into decision-making processes or that their relevance is not fully recognized by senior leaders.
3. **Neutral Responses (14 respondents, 20.9%):** The 14 respondents who are neutral may be unsure about whether executive management takes M&E evaluation reports into consideration or may lack sufficient information to assess this aspect. Their neutrality could indicate variability in experiences or perceptions regarding how M&E reports are handled by the executive team.

Overall, the results indicate that while a majority of respondents believe that executive management considers M&E evaluation reports, there is a notable minority who feel this is not the case. The presence of neutral responses suggests that further clarification or communication about how M&E reports are utilized by the executive team could be beneficial. Addressing the

concerns of those who disagree and engaging with neutral respondents can help ensure that M&E reports are effectively integrated into strategic decision-making processes.

**Table 4.27: The executive considers the M&E appraisal/valuation report**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	9	13.4	13.4	13.4
	Neutral	14	20.9	20.9	34.3
	Agree	25	37.3	37.3	71.6
	strongly agree	19	28.4	28.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

## **27, The Management/Executives actively engages in the M&E assessment report.**

The findings reveal that 9 respondents disagree with the assertion that the management/executives actively participates in the M&E evaluation report. Furthermore, 12 respondents remain neutral, while 46 respondents agree that the management is actively involved in the M&E evaluation report. The results provide an understanding of how involved management or executives are in the M&E evaluation process:

- 1. Agreement on Management Participation (46 respondents, 68.7%):** A majority of respondents (46 out of 67) agree that management or executives are actively involved in the M&E evaluation report. This suggests that most individuals believe that senior leaders take an active role in reviewing and engaging with M&E evaluation findings. Active participation from management is essential for ensuring that M&E results are effectively integrated into strategic planning and decision-making, which can enhance the overall impact of M&E activities on organizational performance.
- 2. Disagreement on Management Participation (9 respondents, 13.4%):** A smaller group of respondents (9 out of 67) disagree, indicating that they feel management, or executives do not actively participate in the M&E evaluation report. This could suggest

concerns about a lack of engagement or involvement from senior leaders in the M&E process. Such a gap may impact the effectiveness of M&E activities if findings are not fully considered or acted upon by those in decision-making positions.

3. **Neutral Responses (12 respondents, 17.9%):** The 12 respondents who remain neutral may be uncertain about the level of management participation or may not have enough information to assess their involvement. This neutrality could reflect variability in experiences or perceptions regarding how involved management is in the M&E process.

Overall, the results indicate that a significant majority of respondents perceive active involvement of management in the M&E evaluation process, highlighting the importance of senior leadership engagement in utilizing M&E findings. However, the concerns of those who disagree and the presence of neutral responses suggest that there variability in perceptions of management involvement or a need for clearer communication about the extent of their participation. Addressing these concerns and ensuring that management engagement is consistent and transparent can help maximize the effectiveness of the M&E process.

**Table 4.28: The Management/Executives actively engages in the M&E assessment report.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	9	13.4	13.4	13.4
	Neutral	12	17.9	17.9	31.3
	Agree	31	46.3	46.3	77.6
	strongly agree	15	22.4	22.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own survey 2023 SPSS

## **28, The senior management/executives endorse M&E approaches.**

The analysis indicates that 6 respondents disagree with the notion that senior management supports M&E practices, while 15 respondents remain neutral, and 46 respondents affirm that

senior management indeed supports M&E practices. The results provide insight into perceptions of senior management’s support for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices:

1. **Agreement on Senior Management Support (46 respondents, 68.7%):** A majority of respondents (46 out of 67) affirm that senior management supports M&E practices. This indicates that most individuals believe that senior leaders are actively backing and endorsing M&E activities. Such support is crucial for ensuring that M&E practices are effectively implemented, adequately resourced, and integrated into the organization’s strategic priorities.
2. **Disagreement on Senior Management Support (6 respondents, 9%):** A smaller group of respondents (6 out of 67) disagree with the assertion, suggesting that they believe senior management does not adequately support M&E practices. This could reflect concerns about insufficient leadership engagement, lack of resources, or inadequate prioritization of M&E activities by senior management.
3. **Neutral Responses (15 respondents, 22.4%):** The 15 respondents who remain neutral may be unsure about the level of support senior management provides to M&E practices or may lack enough information to form a clear opinion. This neutrality could indicate variability in experiences or perceptions regarding how senior management interacts with and supports M&E practices across different teams or projects.

Overall, the results suggest that while a significant majority perceive strong support from senior management for M&E practices, there is a minority who do not share this view, and a notable portion remains uncertain. Addressing the concerns of those who disagree and engaging with neutral respondents can help improve perceptions of senior management support, ensuring that M&E practices are effectively championed and resourced throughout the organization.

**Table 4.29: The senior management/executives endorse M&E approaches.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	5	7.5	7.5	9.0

Neutral	15	22.4	22.4	31.3
Agree	31	46.3	46.3	77.6
strongly agree	15	22.4	22.4	100.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

## 29, The Government delegate is engaged in M&E Assessment.

According to the results of the analysis, 7 respondents disagree with the involvement of government representatives in M&E evaluation, 17 respondents remain neutral, and 43 respondents agree that government representatives actively participate in M&E evaluation. The results reflect the perceptions of government representatives' involvement in the M&E evaluation process:

1. **Agreement on Government Involvement (43 respondents, 64.2%):** A majority of respondents (43 out of 67) agree that government representatives actively participate in M&E evaluations. This suggests that most individuals believe that government stakeholders are involved in the evaluation process, which can enhance the credibility and relevance of M&E findings, particularly in projects or programs with government oversight or collaboration.
2. **Disagreement on Government Involvement (7 respondents, 10.4%):** A smaller group of respondents (7 out of 67) disagree, indicating they do not believe that government representatives are actively involved in M&E evaluations. This could point to concerns about the lack of engagement or presence of government officials in the evaluation process, potentially affecting the integration of governmental perspectives or requirements into M&E activities.
3. **Neutral Responses (17 respondents, 25.4%):** The 17 respondents who are neutral may be unsure about the extent of government involvement in M&E evaluations or may not have enough information to assess their participation. This neutrality could reflect variability in experiences with different projects or programs involving government representatives.

Overall, the results suggest that a significant majority perceive active involvement of government representatives in M&E evaluations, which is important for ensuring that evaluations are comprehensive and aligned with governmental expectations. However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses highlights the need for clearer communication or enhanced engagement with government stakeholders to address any concerns and ensure their effective participation in the M&E process.

**Table 4.30: The Government delegate is engaged in M&E Assessment.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	7	10.4	10.4	10.4
	Neutral	17	25.4	25.4	35.8
	agree	25	37.3	37.3	73.1
	strongly agree	18	26.9	26.9	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

### **30, The Donor is engaged in M&E assessment.**

According to the results, 6 respondents express disagreement regarding the participation of donors in M&E evaluation reports. Additionally, 25 respondents remain neutral, while 36 respondents agree that donors actively participate in M&E evaluation. The results indicate that while a majority of respondents perceive active participation of donors in M&E evaluation reports, a significant portion remains neutral, and a small minority disagrees. This highlights several key points:

- **Majority View:** The majority perception that donors are involved suggests that in many cases, donor engagement is a common practice, potentially contributing to the effectiveness and credibility of the M&E process. This involvement can help ensure that evaluations meet donor expectations and are aligned with funding requirements.

- **Minority Concerns:** The small group of respondents who disagree raises concerns about the level of donor engagement. This could imply challenges in ensuring that all relevant donor perspectives are incorporated into M&E reports, which may affect the comprehensiveness and applicability of evaluation findings.
- **Neutral Perspective:** The substantial number of neutral responses indicates that there may be variability in experiences or a lack of clarity about donor involvement. This suggests the need for improved communication and transparency about how donors are engaged in the M&E process.

Overall, these results suggest that while donor participation is a prevalent practice, there are areas where engagement could be enhanced. Addressing concerns about donor involvement and ensuring clear communication about their role in M&E evaluations can help improve the effectiveness and perceived value of the evaluation process.

**Table 4.31: The Donor is engaged in M&E assessment.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	6	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Neutral	25	37.3	37.3	46.3
	Agree	29	43.3	43.3	89.6
	strongly agree	7	10.4	10.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Source: own Survey

### **31, Response from participants is taken into attention for upcoming projects.**

As per the analysis results, 5 respondents express disagreement with the consideration of feedback from stakeholders for future projects. Furthermore, 10 respondents remain neutral, while 52 respondents agree that feedback from stakeholders is indeed taken into consideration for future projects. The results provide insights into how feedback from stakeholders is integrated into future projects: The results indicate that the majority of respondents perceive that

stakeholder feedback is actively considered in planning future projects, which is a positive sign of responsiveness and engagement with stakeholder needs. This approach is beneficial for ensuring that projects are designed to address the concerns and priorities of those affected by or involved in the projects.

However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses highlights areas where improvements might be needed:

- **Minority Concerns:** The small number of respondents who disagree suggests that there may be gaps in how stakeholder feedback is integrated into future projects. This could point to issues such as inadequate mechanisms for incorporating feedback, or a lack of clarity about how feedback influences project planning.
- **Neutral Perspective:** The significant number of neutral responses indicates that there might be variability in how feedback is perceived and utilized. It may be beneficial to enhance communication and transparency about how stakeholder feedback is used and to ensure that all relevant feedback is effectively incorporated into project planning.

Overall, the results suggest that while stakeholder feedback is generally considered in future projects, addressing concerns and ensuring clear processes for feedback integration can further strengthen project planning and execution.

**Table 4.32: Response from participants is taken into attention for upcoming projects.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Neutral	10	14.9	14.9	22.4
	Agree	32	47.8	47.8	70.1
	strongly agree	20	29.9	29.9	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

**32, M&E methods assist the company in enhancing project execution implementation.**

According to the analysis, 8 respondents express disagreement regarding whether M&E practices support the organization in improving project implementation. Additionally, 5 respondents remain neutral, while 54 respondents agree that M&E practices indeed support the organization in enhancing project implementation. The results indicate a strong consensus among respondents that M&E practices are beneficial in supporting and improving project implementation. This reflects a positive view of how M&E activities contribute to refining project execution, enhancing accountability, and addressing implementation issues.

However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses suggests there are areas for potential improvement:

- **Addressing Disagreement:** The minority who disagree may have specific concerns about the effectiveness or impact of M&E practices. Investigating these concerns could reveal areas where M&E processes can be strengthened or better aligned with project needs. Understanding the gaps perceived by these respondents can inform improvements to ensure that M&E practices more effectively support project implementation.
- **Engaging Neutral Respondents:** The neutral responses indicate that some individuals may not have a clear understanding of how M&E practices influence project implementation. Enhancing communication about the role and benefits of M&E could help clarify its impact and increase overall support and engagement with M&E practices.

Overall, the results highlight the general recognition of the value of M&E in enhancing project implementation, while also pointing to opportunities for refining and improving the effectiveness of M&E practices within the organization.

**Table 4.33: M&E methods assist the company in enhancing project execution implementation.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	7	10.4	10.4	11.9
	Nuetral	5	7.5	7.5	19.4

Agree	31	46.3	46.3	65.7
strongly agree	23	34.3	34.3	100.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

**33, The M&E practice aids in gathering adequate data to address gaps in future project implementation.**

According to the analysis, 8 respondents’ express disagreement with the idea that M&E practices aid in obtaining sufficient data to address gaps for future project implementation. Additionally, 7 respondents remain neutral, while 52 respondents agree that M&E practices do assist in acquiring enough data to fill gaps for future project implementation. The results indicate that a majority of respondents view M&E practices as effective in providing the necessary data to address gaps for future project implementation. This suggests that M&E is generally seen as a valuable tool for improving project design and execution by offering insights that can help in identifying and addressing weaknesses.

However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses points to areas where the effectiveness of M&E practices could be enhanced:

- **Addressing Disagreement:** The minority who disagree may have specific concerns about how M&E practices are implemented or the quality of the data collected. It would be beneficial to explore these concerns to identify potential improvements in data collection and analysis processes. Ensuring that M&E practices are well-aligned with project needs and providing training or resources to address data-related issues could improve perceptions.
- **Engaging Neutral Respondents:** The neutral responses suggest that there may be variability in experiences with M&E practices or a lack of clarity about how data is used. Enhancing communication about the role of M&E in data collection and its impact on future projects could help clarify its value and improve overall understanding.

Overall, the results underscore the general effectiveness of M&E practices in supporting data-driven improvements for future projects, while also highlighting opportunities for refinement to address concerns and enhance the overall impact of M&E activities.

**34, The M&E assessment report is utilized for examining the project's advancement.**

According to the analysis report, 5 respondents disagree with the notion that the M&E evaluation report is used to monitor the progress of the project. Additionally, 9 respondents remain neutral, while 53 respondents agree that the M&E evaluation report is indeed utilized for monitoring the project's progress. The results indicate that a significant majority of respondents perceive that M&E evaluation reports are effectively used for monitoring project progress. This suggests that evaluation reports play an important role in tracking performance, assessing progress, and informing project management decisions.

However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses highlights areas where improvements could be made:

- **Addressing Disagreement:** The small number of respondents who disagree may have specific concerns about how evaluation reports are integrated into monitoring processes. Investigating these concerns can help identify any gaps or issues in the application of evaluation findings and improve how reports are utilized for tracking progress.
- **Engaging Neutral Respondents:** The neutral responses suggest that there may be variability in experiences or a lack of clarity about the use of evaluation reports. Providing clearer information on how evaluation reports are employed in monitoring and ensuring consistent application across projects could help increase understanding and support.

Overall, the results demonstrate that M&E evaluation reports are generally perceived as useful tools for monitoring project progress, while also highlighting opportunities to enhance their application and address concerns related to their use in project management.

**Table 4.35: The M&E assessment report is utilized for examining the project's advancement.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	disagree	4	6.0	6.0	7.5
	Nuetral	9	13.4	13.4	20.9
	Agree	32	47.8	47.8	68.7

strongly disagree	21	31.3	31.3	100.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

### **35, The M&E assessment report is utilized for examining the project's advancement.**

The analysis indicates that 5 respondents express disagreement regarding the use of M&E to evaluate the accomplishment of project goals as per the set objectives. Additionally, 8 respondents remain neutral, while 54 respondents agree that M&E is indeed used for evaluating the accomplishment of project goals as per the objectives set. The results indicate that a strong majority of respondents view M&E practices as effective in evaluating whether project goals are achieved according to the set objectives. This highlights the value of M&E in providing a structured and objective assessment of project performance and goal attainment.

However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses points to areas where improvements could be made:

- **Addressing Disagreement:** The minority who disagree may have specific concerns about the alignment between M&E practices and project objectives. Investigating these concerns can help identify gaps or issues in the evaluation process and improve how M&E is used to measure goal achievement. Ensuring that M&E practices are well-integrated with project objectives and provide meaningful assessments can enhance their effectiveness.
- **Engaging Neutral Respondents:** The neutral responses suggest that some individuals may not have a clear understanding of how M&E practices are used to evaluate goal accomplishment. Providing more information or training on the role of M&E in assessing project outcomes could help clarify its importance and improve overall perceptions.

Overall, the results reflect a positive view of M&E's role in evaluating project goals, while also highlighting opportunities for refining practices and enhancing understanding to ensure comprehensive and effective evaluations of goal attainment.

**Table 4.36 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is utilized to gauge the attainment of project objectives in alignment with predefined targets.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	4	6.0	6.0	7.5
	Neutral	8	11.9	11.9	19.4
	Agree	30	44.8	44.8	64.2
	strongly agree	24	35.8	35.8	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

### **36, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) aids in leveraging experiential insights and addressing future gaps for improved learning and performance**

The analysis reveals that 3 respondents' express disagreement with the idea that M&E assists in learning from experience and filling gaps for the future. Additionally, 7 respondents remain neutral, while 57 respondents agree that M&E indeed aids in learning from experience and addressing gaps for the future. The results indicate a strong consensus that M&E practices are effective in helping organizations learn from past experiences and address gaps for future projects. This underscores the value of M&E in fostering continuous improvement by providing actionable insights that can be used to refine and enhance future project planning and implementation.

However, the presence of disagreement and neutral responses highlights areas where further improvements could be made:

- **Addressing Disagreement:** The small number of respondents who disagree may have specific concerns about how M&E practices support learning and improvement. Investigating these concerns can help identify any gaps in the M&E process and ensure that lessons learned are effectively captured and applied to future projects.
- **Engaging Neutral Respondents:** The neutral responses suggest that some individuals may not fully understand the role of M&E in learning and addressing gaps. Providing clearer information and examples of how M&E findings are used to drive improvements could help enhance understanding and support for M&E practices.

Overall, the results demonstrate a strong perception of M&E's role in facilitating organizational learning and addressing future gaps, while also highlighting opportunities to refine practices and improve communication about the impact of M&E on continuous improvement.

**Table 4.37: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) aids in leveraging experiential insights and addressing future gaps for improved learning and performance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Disagree	2	3.0	3.0	4.5
	Neutral	7	10.4	10.4	14.9
	Agree	28	41.8	41.8	56.7
	strongly agree	29	43.3	43.3	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

**Source: own survey**

## **Chapter 5 – Summary, Conclusion & Recommendation**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This section provides a comprehensive overview of the study focusing on the Evaluation of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices within International NGOs. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play a pivotal role in development projects, allowing project managers to monitor progress, identify obstacles, and make well-informed decisions. Within the realm of international NGOs, M&E assumes heightened significance, given the intricate and varied nature of projects undertaken in demanding environments. This summary delves into the significance of M&E for international NGOs, the hurdles encountered in implementing robust M&E systems, and the optimal practices that can be employed to surmount these challenges.

## **The importance of M&E for International NGO's**

Operating within intricate and diverse landscapes, international NGOs encounter a multitude of challenges such as political instability, social upheaval, economic fluctuations, and environmental degradation. In order to adeptly navigate these challenges, NGOs necessitate robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems to monitor progress, pinpoint challenges, and make well-informed decisions. M&E serves as a crucial tool for these organizations, enabling them to scrutinize the quality and efficacy of interventions, assess the impact of programs, and ensure alignment with the needs of beneficiaries. Furthermore, M&E aids international NGOs in identifying best practices, learning from experiences, and consistently enhancing their programs.

Drawing upon the key findings, a synthesis and conclusions have been formulated, accompanied by practical recommendations to conclude the study.

### **5.2 Summary of Findings**

**Commitment to M&E:** Most organizations demonstrate a robust commitment to integrating M&E into their project schedules, reflecting an understanding of its importance for project success. However, there are a few organizations that could benefit from formalizing their M&E guidelines.

**Diverse Evaluation Methods:** The use of a variety of evaluation methods—such as final and participatory evaluations—suggests a balanced approach that accommodates different project goals and contexts. This diversity in methods indicates a strategic effort to assess both overall impact and stakeholder engagement.

**Role of M&E Staff:** There is a strong reliance on MEAL Managers for M&E activities, underlining the importance of specialized expertise. However, in some cases, Program or Office Managers handle M&E, which may lead to variations in integration and execution.

**Sharing Information:** The majority of respondents emphasize the importance of sharing M&E information with stakeholders and management. Lower emphasis on sharing with donors and government may reflect secondary priorities or selective sharing practices.

**Data Collection Techniques:** Questionnaires are the predominant data collection method, complemented by interviews, observations, and case studies. This combination indicates an appreciation for both quantitative and qualitative data.

**Budget Allocation:** While most respondents are satisfied with M&E budget allocation, there are concerns about underfunding among a minority. Greater transparency and communication about budgeting could address these issues.

**Training and Planning:** There is a notable recognition of M&E training and planning. However, some respondents indicate areas for improvement in these aspects, suggesting the need for enhanced training and clearer planning processes.

**Management Support:** Senior management is generally perceived as supportive of M&E practices, though there are concerns and uncertainties among some respondents about the extent of this support. Improved engagement and communication with management could address these concerns.

**Use of Evaluation Reports:** M&E evaluation reports are viewed as useful for monitoring progress, but there is room for improvement in their application and integration into project management and strategic decision-making.

**Government and Donor Involvement:** Active involvement of government representatives and donors in M&E evaluations is generally recognized, but there are opportunities to enhance these engagements and address any concerns about their roles.

**Stakeholder Feedback:** Feedback from stakeholders is considered in future projects, yet there is potential to improve how this feedback is integrated into project planning and execution.

In conclusion, while M&E practices are widely valued and generally effective, there are several areas for improvement, including formalizing guidelines, enhancing training, improving budget transparency, and strengthening communication with all stakeholders involved. These refinements could further optimize M&E practices and support more effective project outcomes.

### **5.2.1 The organization have M&E system.**

All five International NGOs possess a Monitoring & Evaluation system. Currently, it is a requisite for international organizations to establish a Monitoring & Evaluation system and ensure the presence of dedicated Monitoring & Evaluation staff. Furthermore, the results suggest that these five International NGOs have competent staff, outside the M&E department, capable of effectively managing specific monitoring and evaluation tasks.

### **5.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Practice**

In a broad sense, the five international NGOs have implemented a computerized Monitoring & Evaluation system, suggesting a higher likelihood of obtaining accurate information. The results reveal that these International NGOs actively involve pertinent stakeholders, including beneficiaries, government, donors, and the community, in their Monitoring & Evaluation activities. The participation of the Government in monitoring and evaluation practices of projects undertaken by INGOs is affirmed by 64.2% of the respondents, while 35.8% of the respondents acknowledge that Government staff is not actively engaged in Monitoring and Evaluation practices.

The analysis results reveal that 53.70% of respondents affirm Donor involvement in M&E evaluation practices, whereas 9% of respondents indicate that Donors are not actively engaged in M&E evaluation practices. Additionally, 37.30% of respondents remain neutral on this aspect. The study findings underscore the importance of management commitment to M&E activities, with 68.6% of the five international NGOs demonstrating effective engagement of top-level management in monitoring and evaluation practices. However, 9% of respondents report a lack of support from top management for M&E practices, and 22.4% remain neutral on this matter.

A significant majority, 97%, of these international NGOs rely on written M&E guidelines within their organizations. Hence, the written M&E guideline is observed to be widely utilized as a monitoring and evaluation tool across various stages of the project life cycle. The majority, 77.7% of the respondents from International NGOs, affirm that feedback from stakeholders (Government and Donors) is considered for future projects. Furthermore, in the majority of

International NGOs, Monitoring and Evaluation practices are deemed instrumental in acquiring sufficient data to address gaps in future project implementation.

### **5.2.3 Challenges in Implementing Effective M&E Systems**

In spite of the crucial role Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plays, international NGOs encounter numerous obstacles in establishing effective M&E systems. A primary challenge is the scarcity of resources, encompassing funding, staff, and technical expertise. Many NGOs operate in resource-constrained environments, impeding their ability to allocate adequate resources to M&E activities. Another obstacle arises from the complexity and diversity of their programs, posing difficulties in creating standardized M&E systems applicable to all projects. Additionally, there is often a lack of clarity regarding the objectives and scope of M&E activities, contributing to confusion and hindered implementation.

### **5.2.4 Best Practices for Overcoming M&E Challenges**

To address the challenges associated with effective M&E system implementation, international NGOs can embrace several best practices. A crucial practice involves ensuring adequate resourcing for M&E activities. International NGOs should prioritize M&E, allocating sufficient funding, staff, and technical expertise to ensure the effective conduct of these activities. Another best practice is the development of standardized M&E systems applicable across all projects, promoting consistency and enhancing the overall effectiveness of M&E activities. Additionally, international NGOs should prioritize capacity building, providing training to staff on M&E technical capacities. This ensures that all staff members possess the necessary skills to contribute effectively to M&E activities.

## **5.3 Conclusion:**

This study has provided a comprehensive analysis of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices within the five international NGO, revealing a generally strong commitment to M&E and highlighting both achievements and areas for improvement. The findings indicate that most organizations successfully integrate M&E into their project schedules, reflecting a robust approach to continuous monitoring and evaluation. This commitment is further supported by the

use of diverse evaluation methods and a reliance on MEAL Managers, underscoring the importance of specialized expertise in managing these critical functions.

Despite these positive aspects, several key areas for enhancement have emerged. The findings suggest a need for more formalized M&E guidelines in a minority of organizations, as well as a more consistent approach to budget allocation and communication of M&E practices. While most respondents recognize the value of M&E training and planning, there is notable room for improvement in these areas, particularly in addressing concerns from those who perceive gaps or inconsistencies.

The role of senior management and executive leadership in supporting M&E is crucial, yet there are concerns and uncertainties about the extent of this support and involvement. Enhancing communication and engagement with senior management, as well as clarifying how M&E reports are utilized in decision-making, could strengthen organizational commitment to M&E practices.

In terms of data collection and stakeholder engagement, the use of questionnaires, interviews, observations, and case studies reflects a balanced approach to gathering both quantitative and qualitative insights. However, the results suggest that more effective integration of stakeholder feedback and enhanced involvement of government and donor representatives could further improve the M&E process.

Overall, the study highlights the general effectiveness of M&E in supporting project implementation and organizational learning. The findings demonstrate that while M&E practices are valued and contribute significantly to project success, there are opportunities to refine and enhance these practices. By addressing identified concerns and improving communication, training, and stakeholder engagement, organizations can further optimize their M&E efforts, ensuring they are well-positioned to achieve their strategic objectives and drive continuous improvement.

In conclusion, this study underscores the importance of ongoing evaluation and refinement of M&E practices. Emphasizing formalization, improving training and budgeting processes, and enhancing stakeholder engagement will contribute to more effective M&E activities, ultimately leading to better project outcomes and organizational effectiveness.

#### **5.4 Recommendations:**

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are proposed to enhance the effectiveness and integration of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices for five international NGO :

**Formalize M&E Guidelines:** For organizations where M&E guidelines are not well-developed or formalized, it is recommended to establish comprehensive and standardized M&E frameworks. This will provide clarity and consistency in M&E practices across projects and ensure that all staff members are aligned with the organization's M&E objectives.

**Enhance Communication of M&E Importance:** To address the perception gaps regarding the communication of M&E's importance, organizations should invest in regular, clear, and transparent communication strategies. This includes ensuring that all stakeholders, including neutral and dissenting respondents, understand the value of M&E and how it contributes to project and organizational success.

**Improve Budget Allocation for M&E:** Ensuring that sufficient financial resources are allocated for M&E activities from the outset of project planning is crucial. The five international NGO should work to standardize budget allocations for M&E across all projects and communicate transparently about how these resources are utilized.

**Strengthen Training Programs:** To address concerns about technical capacity and training, five international NGO should enhance their M&E training programs. This includes providing more comprehensive and targeted training for staff, addressing any gaps in knowledge or skills, and regularly updating training materials to reflect best practices and new developments in the field.

**Increase Engagement with Senior Management:** To ensure that senior management is effectively supporting M&E practices, organizations should foster greater involvement of leadership in M&E processes. This includes improving communication about how M&E findings are used in decision-making and actively involving senior management in reviewing and applying M&E results.

**Enhance Stakeholder and Donor Engagement:** Organizations should work on improving engagement with stakeholders, including government representatives and donors, to ensure their active participation in the M&E process. This can be achieved through more inclusive consultation processes and clearer communication about the role and impact of these groups in evaluations.

**Refine Data Collection and Evaluation Methods:** While a variety of data collection methods are already employed, organizations should continually refine their approaches to ensure they are effective and relevant to their specific contexts. This includes balancing quantitative and qualitative methods and integrating stakeholder feedback into evaluation processes.

**Address Concerns About M&E System Clarity:** For respondents who find the scope and purpose of the M&E system unclear, organizations should improve the clarity and communication of the M&E system's objectives. Providing detailed information and engaging with those who are uncertain can help ensure that all stakeholders have a clear and shared understanding of the M&E system.

**Improve Integration of M&E Findings:** To enhance the impact of M&E on decision-making, organizations should ensure that M&E findings are systematically integrated into strategic planning and project management processes. This includes establishing clear processes for utilizing M&E insights to inform decisions and actions.

**Monitor and Evaluate M&E Practices Regularly:** Finally, those organizations should implement regular reviews of their M&E practices to identify areas for improvement and ensure that M&E activities remain effective and relevant. This ongoing evaluation will help organizations adapt to changing needs and continue to strengthen their M&E functions.

By implementing these recommendations, the five International NGO's can enhance their M&E practices, leading to more effective project outcomes, improved organizational learning, and greater overall success.

## **Reference:**

- Agency for Civil Society Organizations Proclamation No. 1113/2019 (CSP/2019).
- Andrew, P., Rebecca, H., Georgina, M. (2009). Monitoring and evaluation of UN-assisted Communication for Development Programs
- ASNAT MULUGETA (2018)- Assessment of Practice and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation: The Case of Local NGOs Executing Health Projects
- Bezawit Tesfaye (2019)- ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICE AT BAMACON ENGINEERING PLC.
- Charities and Societies Agency. (2011). Charities and Societies Proclamation No.621/2009
- Crawford P & Bryce P., (2013). Project Monitoring and Evaluation: A method of enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation.
- Dessalegn et al. (2009),
- Ermias, H. 2007, “Monitoring and evaluation of projects in government organizations: - expectations and practices: MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.
- Ethiopian Management Agency. (2014). Ethiopian Protection of basic services social accountability program, implementation manual. Addis Ababa: unpublished.
- Gashaw, A. (2019). ‘assessment of project monitoring and evaluation practice:’
- Gebremedhin, B., Getachew, A. & Amha, R. (2010). Results based monitoring and evaluation for organizations working in agricultural development:
- Harvey Maylor, (2013). Project Management Fourth Edition.
- Habtamu, (20017)Assessment of Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practices of Ethiopian Airport Enterprise and Factors that Affect Its Effectiveness
- IFRC. (2002). Project level monitoring and evaluation: who really wants to know. The annual report on results and impact of IFRC operations. Office of Evaluation
- Jackson, B. J. (2010). Construction Management. Wiley Publishing, Inc: Indianapolis
- Juan, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2019). Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: a handbook for development practitioners. World Bank Publications.
- Khan, K. (2003). Strengthening of monitoring and evaluation system. Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund, 1-42.
- Lainjo, B. (2015). Monitoring & evaluation: Data management systems.

- Magnen, A. (1991). Education projects: Elaboration, Financing and Management. Paris: Imprimitive Guihier Villaris.
- Mahlet Alemayehu (2021) - Assessment of Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practices: The case of Ethiopian Electric Power (EEP)
- Muluken T., (2017). Assessment of project monitoring & evaluation practice at Dire Dawa Diesel power plant rehabilitation project, Addis Ababa
- Project Management Institute (PMI). (2016). Construction extension: To the PMBOK guide third edition (2nd Ed.). Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute (PMI)
- PATH.(2013). Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of Advocacy, Communication, and Social Mobilization to Support Tuberculosis Prevention and Care.
- Roberts, M. A., (2010). Managing Project Sustainability Key concepts and Issues in Development Administration, Asia-Pacific Journal of Rural Development.
- Scriven C. (1996), Monitoring and evaluation framework for Waverley Action for Youth Service, Social Policy Research Centre Report, University of New South Wales
- White, K. (2013). Evaluating to Learn: Monitoring & Evaluation best practices in Development INGOs. Available at [dukespace.lib.duke.edu](http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu)

**Annex**

**Questioner**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS**

**DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE (GRADUATE PROGRAM)**

This questionnaire is designed to gather data on the structure of on practices and challenges on International nongovernmental organizations face in monitoring and evaluating their projects. The information you provide in response to the item in the questionnaire will be used as a part of the data needed for a study of “**Assessment practice of Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practice- a case study for international NGO**”. The study is being conducted as a part of the undersigned researcher’s study for the partial fulfillment for the award of MSC in Accounting and Finance from Addis Ababa University.

The questionnaire is anonymous; so please do not write your name. You are highly encouraged and expected to respond to each question with the most truthful and can did way possible. I would like to assure you that your response will only be used for the intended academic purpose and will be maintained confidential.

If you need any further clarification, please contact me via mobile +251911870387 or [getinetteferi@gmail.com](mailto:getinetteferi@gmail.com)

Thank You in advance for your time and cooperation.

With best regards,

Getinet Teferi

## **Section I**

1. Level of Education:

- Diploma
- First Degree
- Masters
- PHD

2. Current position at the firm:

- Program manager
- Program Staff- non manager
- Finance Manager
- Finance Staff – non manager
- Meal Manager

3. Number of years worked in current position:

- Less than 5 years
- 6-10 years
- above10 years

## **Section II: M&E Practice**

1. Is there an M&E system in place within the organization?

- Yes
- No

2. Are there written guidelines for M&E within the organization?

- Yes
- No

3. Are Monitoring and Evaluation activities integrated into the project schedule?

- Yes

- No

4. Evaluation methods employed by your organization.

- Technical monitoring
- Assumption monitoring
- Financial monitoring
- Quality monitoring

5. What type of Evaluation does the organization uses?

- Participatory evaluation
- Final evaluation
- Internal evaluation
- External Evaluation

6, The individual responsible for conducting M&E at the project site

- Project Manager
- Project Coordinator
- Meal Manager
- Office Manager

7, To whom is the Monitoring and Evaluation provided?

- To all staffs
- To the management
- To stakeholders and owners of the project

- To Government
- To Donors

8, What tools and techniques does your organization use to collect data?

- a. Questionnaire
- b. Interview
- c. Observation
- d. Case study
- e. Site Visit Report
- f. Focus group discussion

How do you agree with the following?

Use 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4-Agree and 5-Strongly agree.

No	Statement	1 strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
1.	Sufficient budget allocation is made by the organization at the project's outset.					
2	M&E planning processes are incorporated into the project plans.					
3	The organization ensures that all staff members understand the significance of M&E.					
4	The clarity regarding the scope and purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation is evident.					
5	The organization assesses planned activities against the realized ones.					
6	Is the planning process adequately detailed?					
7	Does the organization provide M&E training to its staff?					

8	Planning process adequately detailed					
9	Project staff trained to develop their technical capacity in M&E					
10	Sufficient budgets allocated for Monitoring and Evaluation					
11	M&E information is utilized to aid in managerial decision-making and planning.					
12	The organization dedicates ample time and establishes a schedule for monitoring and evaluation.					

### Section III: Technical M&E practice

No	Statement	1 strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 S a
1	Capable and skilled staff members handle M&E tasks.					
2	Project staff are trained to equip them with technical expertise necessary to carry out M and E					
3	There is competent skilled staff to carry out M&E practices					
4	The organization's Senior Management Team emphasizes M&E practices					
5	There are implementation indicators set for (Inputs, Activities, and outputs)					

## Section V: Challenges

No	Statement	1 strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
	The necessary resource is allocated for M&E					
	The Management support M&E practice					
	Enough budget is allocated for M & E					
	<b>Management participation</b>					
	The executive considers the M&E appraisal/valuation report.					
	The senior management/executives endorse M&E approaches.					
	A support from Management for M & E practice					
	The Government representative participate in M & E					
	Donors participate in M & E					
	Feedback from Stakeholders (Government and Donors) take in to consideration for the future projects					

**Section IV: Significance of M&E practice**

No	Statement	1 strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
1	The current M&E practice of the firm helps in improving project performance.					
2	The M&E practice helps in acquiring sufficient data to be used as a basis for project modification.					
3	M&E evaluation report used to monitor the progress of project.					
4	M&E can be used to evaluate the achievement of project objectives.					
5	M&E helps in learning from experience and in adapting necessary changes.					