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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Annual Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPMU</td>
<td>Central Project Planning and Monitoring Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS</td>
<td>Economic Research Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERSWEC</td>
<td>Economic Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFMIS</td>
<td>Integrated Financial Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRSP</td>
<td>Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPR</td>
<td>Joint Aids Programme Review Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMER</td>
<td>Ministerial Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPER</td>
<td>Ministerial Public Expenditure Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP</td>
<td>Medium Term Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACC</td>
<td>National AIDS Control Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMES</td>
<td>National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEM</td>
<td>Public Expenditure Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR</td>
<td>President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Public Expenditure Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Price Waterhouse Coopers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASREB</td>
<td>Water Services Regulatory Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

This study sought to evaluate the performance of projects linked to Faith based organizations in Meru North. The study was guided by 4 objectives namely; to determine the influence of M&E Planning on performance of projects funded by faith based organizations, to examine the influence of Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis on performance of projects funded by faith based organizations, to assess the influence of Staff Capacity in M & E on performance of projects funded by faith based organizations and to establish the influence of utilization of results in M&E on performance of projects funded by faith based organizations. The study used 4 theories namely; Theory of Change, Results based management Theory, Program Theory and Prospect Theory. The study adopted a descriptive research design. The study targeted the management of the 47 Faith Based Organizations in Meru North comprising of consisting of steering committee, resource officers, team leaders and project committee members. From the target population of 347, a sample of 186 were selected for this study. The study adopted a descriptive research design. Questionnaires were administered as key instruments for data collection. Quantitative data was analyzed and presented through descriptive and inferential statistics using SPSS (version 25) whereas qualitative data was summarized using detailed narrative. The findings were presented in form of tables. The study found that technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects, that that project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&E and that that the skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation. It was concluded that M&E planning had the greatest influence on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya followed by utilization of results, then monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis while staff capacity had the least influence on the performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study recommends that all relevant stakeholders’ interests’ impact and influence should be enhanced in planning. Further, the organization need to have a computerized database for storage and analysis software’s and data collection tools; have skilled personnel and progress and results review platforms and reporting templates. It is recommended that the organizations should support adequate training of the field staff involved in monitoring and evaluation through offer of adequate training for the requisite skills.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
Monitoring and evaluation of project improves overall efficiency and therefore various projects are started with the sole goal of changing positively the socio-political and economic status of the residents of a given region. The project information is obtained in an orderly and sequential manner as the project is on-going. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has become a leading priority for many development and humanitarian organizations. Advancements in measurement approaches, indicators and targets, performance monitoring and managing for results (impact) have been made in recent years in order to adequately and effectively evaluate progress and project impact on development matters.

Monitoring involves identifying factors accounting for progress of activities or success of output production. Impact monitoring involves measuring the initial responses and reactions to project activities and their immediate short-term effects. Naidoo (2011) noted that if the M&E function is located in a section or associated with significant power in terms of decision-making, it is more likely to be taken seriously. This means that the monitoring team needs to be enhanced and strengthened in order for it to have more power which will increase its effectives. In addition to power of M&E teams other factors also play a role in strengthening monitoring teams which includes: frequency of scope monitoring to identify changes, number of persons monitoring project schedule, extent of monitoring to detect cost over runs, (Ling et al., 2009). Magondu (2013) also noted that financial availability is the main resource in any functional organization as far as other resources such as human are concerned. To set up a monitoring department, finances are required. Therefore, the staffs need to be equipped with the relevant skills for performance.

Though monitoring and evaluation practices have substantial cost, time as well as human resource implications, they are very vital for projects performance and should not be overlooked at the beginning of the process (Khan, 2013). It is then important to ensure that the management along with the donor agencies apprehend and are overly focused to these overheads and are committed to implement the recommendations arising from monitoring and evaluation (Dyason, 2010). It is important that the project managers recognized the methods and the thinking that is
based on monitoring and evaluation practices used. It is equally essential that the performance of the projects accept responsibility for the used processes, are dedicated to them, and feel vested to convince other stakeholders of their support along with their benefits in the long run. The requirement is that there should be notable effort at an initiative’s inception in the course of identifying who the main target groups and understanding the anticipated outcomes that are desired for each group. Besides that, apart from improving quality as well as the likelihood of sustainability, this method creates awareness and also helps in building capacity.

Monitoring provides the background for reducing schedule and cost overruns (Crawford & Bryce, 2003), while ensuring that required quality standards are achieved in project implementation. Monitoring is regarded as core tool for enhancing the quality of project management, taking into account that in short and medium run managing complex projects will involve corresponding strategies from the financial point of view, which are supposed to respect the criteria of effectiveness, sustainability and durability. Monitoring activity supports both project managers and staff in the process of understanding whether the projects are progressing on schedule or meet their objectives, inputs, activities and deadlines (Solomon & Young, 2007).

Globally, Countries like Canada, United Kingdom and United States are major donors that support the developing countries. In the United States there exists an American Evaluation Association (AEA). The World Bank (2009) argues that the need for good governance, sustained and rapid development in Africa led to recognition of Monitoring and Evaluation as a profession and as a result the first African Monitoring and Evaluation association was formed in 1998. According to the World Bank, putting up an effective M&E system is of enormous value for it makes processes more transparent as well as providing clear regulatory framework to achieving results (World Bank, 2012).

Australia is one of the leading countries in the world in embracing M&E systems in the development projects (UNDP, 2012). The government created a full- fledged government evaluation system, managed by the Department of Finance (DOF). This provided a spending baseline and freed up the budget process from a detailed, line item scrutiny of spending, to focus instead on changes in government policy and spending priorities in the development projects. The government of Australia advocated the principles of program management and budgeting, with a focus on the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs, through sound
management practices, the collection of performance information, and the regular conduct of program evaluation (Mackay, 2011). Project sustainability is a major challenge in many developing countries. Large number of projects are implemented at huge costs often tend to experience difficulties with sustainability. All major donors, such as the World Bank, the Asian Development bank and the bilateral aid agencies have been expressing concerns on this matter (Khan, 2012).

Love et al (2015) states that cost and time overruns in Australia in traditional and new systems accounts for 13-19% of cost overruns and 10 to 69% of time overruns. New systems give 11% and 13 to 25% respectively. Baloi and Price (2016), many contractors are unfamiliar with these institutional factors and do not have experience and knowledge to manage them effectively and efficiently. Monitoring and evaluation in the past has been judgmental, M&E seeks to involve all key stakeholders in the process of developing framework for measuring results and reflecting on the projects’ achievement and proposing solutions based on local realities (Coupal, 2011).

In Canada, accountability is a highly held norm in government and charity organisation. However, emphasis is largely placed on financial accountability. Kirsch (2013) observes that although financial accountability has been around for thousands of years in Canada, fairness and performance accountability standards have not been developed at the country or international levels but rather at the discretion of individual practitioners, organizational directives or rules established by finders. In addition, monitoring for results seem not to be prioritized with emphasis being placed on implementation of monitoring of projects in charity organizations. Much of the performance accountability by charities in Canada has been about inputs and outputs without regard to outcomes and impacts, or the resulting value to the community.

In Africa, lack of jobs is part of a much bigger of under development. Most countries are yet to find a way out. Worst still is the youthfulness of the population implying a high dependency ratio for these countries. Citizens face serious challenges resulting from poverty, unemployment and underemployment. These challenges hinder their social and economic development. The overall unemployment rate for the youth is double the adult. The problem of unemployment has become a matter of serious policy concern in the country. However, as most sub-Saharan African countries countries are poor, impact evaluation studies are under-funded. Due to this, impact evaluators rush to finish the study using small samples, within short periods of time and using
less competent professionals. South African government has placed increasing importance on Monitoring during its third term of office since democracy (Florin, 2011). Several studies were done to examine factors impacting on project performance in developing countries. A study by Faridi and El-Sayegh (2006) reported that shortage of skilled manpower, poor supervision and poor site management, unsuitable leadership; shortage and breakdown of equipment due to ineffective monitoring practices contributed to project delays in the United Arab Emirates. As established by Mbachu and Nkando (2007), that quality and attitude of service are key factors constraining successful monitoring practices on project delivery in South Africa.

Over the past ten years, M&E has gained prominence over more conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation in the developing countries especially in Africa. According to CARE (2012) monitoring and evaluation therefore is a necessary condition for ensuring the sustainability of development process in African based agribusiness projects. M&E involves the assessment of change through processes that involve many people or groups each of whom is affecting or affected by the impact being assessed. However, the biggest gap at that time had been with respect to documentation of monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The association formed is known as, Africa Evaluation Association, (AfrEA) (Naidoo, 2010). Monitoring and evaluation is fragmented in Uganda according to Dijkstra (2011), with multiple government and donor planning and progress reporting formats. Policy formulation, work planning and budgeting are undertaken as separate exercises at the sector and district levels. From an M&E perspective the major problem is that both information management and decision making is focused on the administrative process of expenditures and activities rather than on the poverty outcomes, impacts and goals that are being pursued.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED) is charged with the responsibility of operationalizing the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation system (NIMES) in agribusiness projects. According to GOK (2011), NIMES is an instrument of governance under the Results Based Management System designed to show transparency in the execution of government, civil society, private sector and donor programs and projects. It is a central tracking, reporting and evaluating system for all developments, inputs, outputs and outcomes as well as resource utilization. Borrowing a leaf from South African Government, the Kenya government
has also started ministry contracting method where each ministry outlines what they would want
to do, indicators and expected outcomes (GoK, 2012).

The monitoring and evaluation systems has not been that effective to several challenges
especially in the government sector. In the year 2005, The Ministry of Planning and National
Development commissioned work on the design of an appropriate framework for Monitoring and
Evaluation (M&E) in the National Development Program.

Andove and Mike (2015) assessed how monitoring affects the outcome of constituency
development fund projects in Kenya. The aim of the study was to establish whether the project
monitoring and control efforts of the contractors and project supervisors contribute to an
improved project outcome. Jackson, Joseph and Ben (2015) analyzed factors affecting the
effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of constituency development fund projects in Kenya.
The objective of the study was to establish the factors affecting monitoring and evaluation on the
projects with reference to technical capacity political influence stakeholders’ participation and
budgetary allocation of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) projects in Kenya.

The government also has a stringent monitoring and evaluation electronic system, the E-Pro
MIS, whose purpose is to ensure continuous monitoring and evaluation of the progress of the
projects at all stages. To ensure relevance of projects undertaken, the government is a key player
in determining the actual projects carried out. To achieve this, at times the government decides
which projects to fund and, in some instances, the projects could be uniform in institutions of the
same category, such as the twin-workshop projects that were funded simultaneously in all the
technical training institutions, with the same design and size, among other specifications. Other
conditions that the government applies when funding projects in post-secondary institutions
include adapting one of the following options: Require the institution to initiate the project to a
certain level, then fund the rest of it or have the institution fund the project then seek
reimbursement from the government or the government funds the project from start to finish.

Despite the numerous that have been made under NIMES, Kenya’s M&E system still faces
challenges in the achievements implementation namely: human capital, financial and
infrastructural challenges (CLEAR, 2012). In its progress report UNDP Amkeni Wakenya
highlights some of the challenges that it faced in monitoring and evaluation of CSO activities in
its grant making and capacity development mandates (Amkeni Wakenya, 2009). The narrative
and financial reports from the UNDP partner CSOs were not consistent in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness. Additionally, most partner CSOs had limited monitoring and evaluation skills.

Project Performance is accomplishment of a project measured against present known standards of accuracy and completeness (Munns & Bjeirmi, 2010). Project performance remains a noticeable issue in extend conveyance everywhere throughout the world. Most well-known determinants of undertakings exhibitions acknowledged by inquire about group are: extend mission, top administration bolster, extend plan/design, customer counsel, faculty, and innovation to help the venture, customer acknowledgment, observing and criticism, channels of correspondence, investigating skill.

Great clients ensure that project has the right resources to get work done and great project managers articulate clear vision on resource requests and right size needed in projects implementation (Pacelli, 2009). Effective clients are an advocate, coach and battering ram for the project and effective project managers know how to leverage a client and listen to the client’s counsel. A project will be considered absolutely effective on the off chance that it gets finished on time, inside spending plan and performs precisely to the architect’s particulars. In Kenya community water projects have always provided a platform to showcase leadership qualities for potential or aspiring politicians. This coupled with a slow flow of finances from CDF and other donors has resulted in the incumbent politicians to keep a very close eye on the management and individuals in the committees. A lot of wrangles in the community initiatives. This can be witnessed by the many committees that claim to be legitimate members of the water project. In Siakago, reports from the media indicated the implementation of a water project has been halted due to incitement and wrangles of the area leaders (Pacelli, 2009).

In Wajir County, most of the development projects that have been initiated have stalled due to poor evaluation criteria. The project evaluation that have been conducted have yielded poor results on the progress of the projects. This has led to failure of the projects and ultimate closure. There have been reports in the media decrying the inadequate evaluation of projects implemented in Wajir. The report highlights the lack of accountability for the disbursed funds and absence of any evident of the attainment of the objectives of which the funds were disbursed
to the county. The county has failed to submit reports detailing expenditure and impact of the funds that had been disbursed.

Due to increased emphasis on projects and the fact that the utility of a project depends upon successful project completion, project management field of study has emerged as a distinct discipline from general management (Cleland & Ireland, 2002). Project Management is a competency of strategic nature that makes it possible for implementers to link PO to goals of a business (Project Management Institute, 2013). For institutions undertaking a number of short-term oriented customer projects, Kerzner (2008) noted that Project Management is mostly meant to have total control over firm’s resources in a specified task within time, cost, acceptable level of performance and good customer relations constrains.

Monitoring and Evaluation practice is indispensable; that is significant in ensuring that major objectives and goals of the projects are achieved (Mwangi, Nyang’wara & Ole Kulet, 2015). These objectives and goals include activation of development activities at constituency level so as to fight poverty at the grass root level, promotion of equity in sharing national resources and providing an opportunity for local communities to participate in development planning and project implementation (Kenya Human Rights Commission, 2010).

The Kenyan Constitution provides a strong foundation for the country’s M&E practices by strongly advocating for responsive, accountable and effective institutions (Republic of Kenya, 2012). Given the clarity of the transformation agenda in Kenya’s state, provided by the new constitution and vision 2030 there is a unique opportunity for planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation to be placed at the heart of new institutional arrangements (Republic of Kenya, 2007). The Kenya Water Act 2002 envisaged to bring out reforms in the water sector. Key among its provision was establishment of an institution called WASREB whose major objective is M&E of the water sector.

NIMES was designed to have a three-tier institutional relationship for generating M&E information. At the national level is MED, that provides leadership and coordinates the system by ensuring that two vital sources of M&E information, namely Annual Progress Reports (APRs) on the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) of Vision 2030 and Annual Public Expenditure Review (PER) are ably and timely produced. At ministerial level are the Central Project Planning and Monitoring Units (CPPMUs). The CPPMUs produce Ministerial Annual Monitoring and
Evaluation Reports (MAMERs), and Ministerial Public Expenditure Reviews (MPERs) which are synthesized into the APR and PER respectively. At sub-national level, the District Development Officers, supervised by the Provincial Directors of Planning, were meant to produce the District Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports.

A major phase in the evolution of M&E in Kenya was the introduction of the Kenya Vision 2030 in 2008, which replaced the ERS as the country’s development blueprint. Vision 2030 became the principle driver of development in Kenya and therefore the basis for NIMES. When in 2008, Kenya Vision 2030 as the national developmental policy replaced ERS; NIMES was re-oriented to M&E of the implementation of the Vision. According to Republic of Kenya (2012), the M&E responsibility was at this time, however, divided between MED and a new tailor-made body, within the then, Ministry of Planning responsible for flagship programs and projects in Kenya Vision 2030.

Formalized M&E system was introduced with the approval of Kenya’s Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (IPRSP) in August 2000. According to the World Bank, however, I-PRSP was not submitted formally to the Bank and the fund on account of the December 2002 elections (The World Bank, 2012). In other words, the anticipated M&E system for supporting I-PRSP did not materialize. In parallel to the ERSWEC the government started to implement performance contracting. Initially utilized to revive two state corporations in the late 1990s, performance contracting was re-introduced as a pilot in 2004 comprising 16 public commercial enterprises before expanding two years later to embrace the whole of Kenya’s public service.

From 2006 – 2008 performance contracting fell within the Results for Kenya Program, which was implemented through the Cabinet Office. This program started to introduce service charters and reinforce a message of customer orientation in government. In the then, Ministry of Finance and National Treasury, Public Expenditure Management (PEM) was being reinforced by a number of reforms aimed at improving transparency and accountability. The Government Financial Management Act (2004) supported Public Expenditure Management by providing a legal framework for managing public finances. The Act sought to improve in particular preparation, execution and monitoring of the national budget. Financial officers from the Treasury placed in central ministries were an innovation, as was the newly-created function of the National Budget Director. Existing systems to improve financial management and reporting,
namely, the Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) was streamlined and re-enforced

In Kenya, Faith based organizations have been involved in the health sector in the fight against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. To be precise, they have played a crucial role in HIV programming including mobilizing, supporting and empowering communities to respond effectively to HIV and AIDS. In implementing the multi-sectoral approach, Faith based organizations representatives have been engaged at all levels of government implementation right from serving on the Board of the National Aids Control Council (NACC), to other levels of planning and decision making like the Joint Aids Programme Review Process (JAPR), and sitting on the Global Fund Country Coordinating Mechanism. On the other hand, Faith based organizations acting on their own initiatives are engaged on a wide range of programmatic activities that play a critical positive role in management of HIV and AIDS. These include; capacity building, providing treatment, care and support, involvement in policy development, design, implementation and research on numerous HIV related issues (A Health Rights Advocacy Forum-HERAF, 2006). When implementing HIV/AIDS, projects practices such as planning, adoption of information technology, risk management among others come from both the good and bad experiences of other organizations. According to a study conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers in 2004, organizations using project management methodology increases the likelihood of higher-performing projects (PWC, 2004). Most Faith based organizations in the country have endorsed rules that include the provision of M&E practices in their various initiatives to provide the opportunity to improve operations at a minimal cost.

One of the Faith based organizations in the country is the diocese of Nakuru which is among the largest dioceses covering two counties of Nakuru and Baringo. The catholic diocese of Nakuru (CDN) has actively been involved in promotion of community development services through means like provision of water, health, education, agriculture and training services. The church has instigated 13 programmes and over 100 institutions based in 50 Parishes. Through the 13 Programmes, CDN had been able to mobilize communities at the grass root level for development using available resources and initiated income generating activities (IGAs) in collaboration with development partners. Considering the initiation of these programmes, the
diocese saw the need to employ M&E unit to offer the monitoring and evaluation services in the 100 institutions to ensure that all the programmes’ goals were achieved (Kagunya, 2017).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Over the year’s organizations running projects in Kenya have recorded increased funding but there has been little or no assessment on the grass root capacities for these organizations to implement projects successfully. This has led to varied outcomes across different sectors. There has been increased number of litigations, wastage of resources, negative reputation of clients and professionals involved in unsuccessful projects as well as lack of envisioned product, service or change (Jugdev & Muller, 2012). Not only does best practices require that projects are monitored for control but also project stakeholders require transparency, accountability for resource use and impact, good project performance and organizational learning to benefit future projects. Projects regularly complain of poor performance of the projects or projects taking long time to complete and others not complete at all. This has resulted in a gaping underperformance of many projects not only in Kenya but worldwide.

Most FBOs do not have skilled M&E professionals who understand M&E systems and are able to develop appropriate tools (Chesos, 2010). FBO staffs need to be educated on M&E through handbooks in order to increase quality, establishment of a national professional association of evaluators to aid in developing technical skills among the M&E specialists (Jaszczolt & Potkanski, 2010). Hence, they end up with substandard M&E systems that don’t meet donor needs and amount to failure in these projects. On the contrary most projects are taking longer time to be completed, end up not achieving their intended objectives and most of them are not able to sustain themselves after the donor has pulled out all because M&E practices are not observed during the implementation and execution of these projects (Roberts, 2010).

Monitoring and evaluation, although very essential in improving performance, is also very complex, multidisciplinary and skill intensive processes. Building a resulted based M&E system is a requirement by the growing pressure to improving performance which is also one of the requirements by the FBO and donor’s to check on the effective use of the donor funds, impact and benefits brought by the projects. Hence there is a need for establishment of rules for constructing minimum parameters for monitoring and evaluation for projects that can be used to track progress and effectiveness (Jha, Barenstein, Phelps, Pittet & Sena, 2010).
Githika (2013) studied on Influence of Project Management Practices on Implementation of HIV and AIDS Projects: A Case of Civil Society Organizations in Imenti North Subcounty, Meru County Kenya. Micah (2017) focused on the influence of monitoring and evaluation systems on performance of non-governmental projects in Kenya. A case of maternal health projects in Bungoma south sub-county, Kenya. Njenga (2018) assessed the factors influencing performance of NGOs’ health projects in Kenya: a case of maternal health project in Bungoma South sub-county. Most studies about influence of M&E systems have been done especially on construction works or NGOs with few studies existing in FBO projects in general. Due to the above-mentioned challenges it has become almost essential to examine the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this research was to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya.

1.4 Research Objectives
The study was guided by the following objectives

i. To assess the influence of monitoring and evaluation planning on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations

ii. To determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations

iii. To establish the influence of utilization of results on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations

iv. To assess the influence of staff capacity on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations

1.5 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following Research Questions

i. What is the influence of M&E Planning on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations?
ii. To what extent does monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis influence performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations?

iii. To what extent does utilization of results influence performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations?

iv. How does Staff Capacity influence the performance of projects funded by faith based organizations?

1.6 Significance of the Study

Project managers in Faith Based Organizations can learn the factors that surround running of various projects. This enables them to successfully tackle different factors appropriately and timely to ensure the desired outcomes of the projects are achieved. This study would also assist them in identifying weaknesses in the various projects they would carry and thereby improving its performance.

The findings of the study provides donors with information relating to monitoring and evaluation practices of such projects in Kenya. The donor community is able to set realistic outcomes depending on their influence to the management of the projects and to acknowledge any gaps that exist in their monitoring and evaluation practices. The donors would also be able to improve on their mitigation measures.

The study provides stakeholders with information on how to set-up and implement monitoring and evaluation systems that would be strong by avoiding the mistakes that would be pointed out in the study. The project management internal and external stakeholders might use the research findings to evaluate the monitoring and evaluation practices and the extent to which they affect project in advent of improving its performance as well as strategic management in provision of information to inform setting and adjustment of objectives and strategies according to their interest, influence and impact to the project.

The findings of the study will help Government/policy makers and oversight authorities to formulate effective monitoring practices that would ensure FBO projects processes are transparent, efficient, fair and accountable among stakeholders involved, by building the capacity. Further insights in this issue are of great importance to scholars in project management generally. As well as contribute to organizational learning and knowledge sharing by reflecting
upon and sharing experiences and lessons within state corporations. To academic fraternity, the study would enable them understand monitoring dimensions and open up opportunities for further research in monitoring field and contribute to the body of knowledge through diversity ideas to narrow the research gap in the area of monitoring.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study
This study was conducted in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study dwelt on the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The researcher focused on the four variables namely; monitoring and evaluation planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and utilization of results. The study target population was the managers of the 47 Faith Based Organisations in Meru North Sub-County consisting of steering committee, resource officers, team leaders and project committee members.

1.8 Limitation of the Study
Data was collected from Faith Based Organizations in Meru North Sub-County managers who are generally busy due to the nature of their work. This could have affected the response rate. To counter this challenge the questionnaires were dropped and picked later. Prior arrangements to deliver and pick questionnaire was made to ensure the respondents are met at their convenience.

The study encountered some limitations where the respondents were unwilling to give accurate information for fear that the information may be sensitive or confidential bearing in mind the level of importance attached to quality. Non-response rate may also be high. This results from the positions held by the respondents. Therefore, the researcher carried an introduction letter from the university and the respondents were assured that the information gathered was used for academic purposes only. Another challenge was delayed response to the questionnaires by some staff while others lost them in the process, making me to frequently provide additional copies. In this regard, the researcher made prior arrangements to have research instruments delivered to the respondents so as not to interrupt the working schedules of the respondents and give the respondents two to three days to respond to the questionnaires.
1.9 Assumptions of the Study
The researcher assumed that there was no significant change in the target population throughout the study period. The researcher also assumes that the respondents gave truthful and objective responses. The study also assumed that Project Officers, Project Managers and Project committee members were available during the data collection process and that they gave reliable and unbiased information. The study further assumed that relevant information on the study was available and also that the variables being discussed in the study greatly influence performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations in Meru County.

1.10 Definition of significant Terms
A framework is a support structure established to act as a means for meeting a given need. It consists of people, entities, rules and systems.

A project is a temporary endeavor with a defined beginning and end (usually time-constrained, and often constrained by funding or deliverables), undertaken to meet unique goals and objectives (Bradley, 2016).

Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a process that helps improve performance and achieve results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact.

Monitoring is the project-long process of ascertaining whether the plan has been adhered to, any deviations noted and corrective undertaken in timely manner (ADRA, 2007).

Project management is the discipline of planning, organizing, motivating and controlling resources to achieve specific goals.

Project Performance: Accomplishment of a project measured against present known standards of accuracy and completeness.

1.11 Organizational of the Study
This study is organized in five chapters. Chapter one covers the background pertinent to the study. It goes further to state the research problem, the purpose of the study, the research
objectives and questions to guide the study. Covered further in the chapter is the description of the delimitations of the study, limitations and concludes with definition of terms significant to the study.

Chapter two presents the literature review relevant to influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations. The theoretical and conceptual framework is discussed. The chapter ends with the findings by other researchers being presented, discussed and a summary of gaps highlighted.

Chapter three explains the research design, population of the study, the sample size and sample procedure. It discusses the research instruments including their administration, validity and reliability. The chapter ends with a discussion of data analysis methods and operational definition of variables.

Chapter four explains the data analysis made and how the analyzed data is to be presented. It reduces raw data to intelligible and interpretable form using statistics. It interprets the relationships, differences and meaning of research results.

Chapter five gives a summary of the findings of the study. A discussion of the findings is done in this chapter. This is done by comparing and contrasting of the findings with other empirical findings show how the findings agree or disagree with the existing body of knowledge.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter has reviewed literature related to the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. The monitoring and evaluation practices include: M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and utilization of results. Theories related to the study variables, conceptual framework, summary and the research gap was also discussed.

2.2 Performance of Projects
Good project performance entails that the project covers its scope within schedule and budget and attaining its set objectives. Effective M&E of projects is usually one of the ingredients of good performance. It provides means of accountability, demonstrating transparency to the stakeholders and facilities organizational learning through documenting lessons learned in the implementation of the project and incorporating the same in the subsequent project planning and implementation or through sharing experiences with other implementers (World Bank, 2012).

The disappointment of any project is primarily identified with the issues and disappointment of the administration. Viable administration of undertakings is probably going to be effectively overseeing communications to meet customer, client and other partner necessities (The Project Management Institute, 2014). High quality relationship between project managers and project clients are generally no coincidence and the same interaction between those people and the others they deal with usually exists. The relationship between these project managers and project clients within a project can be the main attributable factor to success or failure (Makins, 2011).

The severity of corruption practices has intensified the search for more innovative means of delivering infrastructure projects that will achieve value for money. To address these challenges, it would require the constitution of sound monitoring system and pro-social equity policies that would foster transparency, competition, fairness and cost effectiveness, in public expenditure. Proper monitoring practices will help organizations to adopt the principle factors namely: transparency, competition, fairness and cost effectiveness in public entity contracting works,
goods, and services, it shall do so in accordance with a system that is fair, equitable, transparency, competitive and cost-effective (RoK 2013).

Participatory monitoring are one of the approaches used in monitoring of performance. The World Bank (2013) characterizes participatory monitoring as the approach that includes partners, for example, the project recipients, staff, and government and group in the outline and usage of the project monitoring rather than the traditional approach. In a perfect world, every one of the partners in the participatory observing are engaged with distinguishing the project, the destinations and objectives and recognizable proof of the markers that were utilized as a part of monitoring.

Managing development projects require an operational M&E system. The M & E system is the set of planning, information gathering and synthesis, reflection, and reporting processes, along with the necessary supporting conditions and capacities required for the outputs of M & E to make valuable contributions to decision making and learning. A well-functioning M & E system manages to integrate the more formal, data-orientated side commonly associated with the task of M&E together with informal monitoring and communication, such as project field staff sharing impressions of their fieldwork with each other and their managers over lunch (or coffee).

2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Planning and Performance of Projects
Planning when done effectively has been known to lead to success of projects using all the parameters of time, cost and quality. In their review, Hermano, López-Paredes, Martín-Cruz and Pajares (2012) provided planning as plausible explanation for the success of development projects – that they are able to meet set targets due to effective planning. The process of M&E planning and implementation is able to resolve inherent challenges ranging from conceptual differences about the projects if there are well thought out and capture proper technical and economic considerations (Agheneza, 2009; Khang & Moe, 2008). Further, they should have the necessary basic information obtained through sufficient investigation and surveys to adequate project monitoring throughout the project lifecycle and in-depth evaluation exercise. Where all the above factors are considered, development projects such as health projects tend to have strong links between sectoral planning and project identification, /feasibility and formulation, and between project preparation/project appraisal and project implementation (Golini & Landoni, 2013).
Clear definition of the purpose and scope of the intended M & E system helps when deciding of issues such as budget levels, number of indicators to track, type of communication needed and so forth. When formulating the project purpose at appraisal or revising it during start-up, the organization should ask themselves the following questions; what are the main reasons to set up and implement M & E for implementing partners and primary stakeholders and for other key stakeholders.

Developing an M&E plan requires a proper understanding of the project, inputs, processes, output and outcomes according to (Cooke, Bill, & Uma, 2001). The inputs required would include human resources with M&E technical capacity and resources, authority and mandate to develop the M&E plan and technology infrastructure as noted by (Kalali, Ali & Davod, 2011). The process would involve advocating for the need for M&E, assessing strategic information needs (including planning for M&E utilization dissemination), achieving consensus and commitment among stakeholders, particularly on indicators and reporting structure & tools, developing mechanism for M&E plan review, and preparing document for final approval. Detailed M&E planning commences by breaking down the components into sub-components to produce a product (deliverables) breakdown structure as far as breakdown is feasible.

2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis and Performance of Projects

The success or failure of the M&E process depends on steps taken in sharing the information. The funding agencies usually form the group of important stakeholders that need feedback on the progress of the project they funded. There needs to be a balance between successes and mistakes of the project when delivering the information to the funding agencies. Those involved in the project will also need to be informed of the outcomes of the project (Ebrahim, 2010).

The culmination of the reporting process is the translation of gathered data into information ready to inform decision making using formats accessible to policy makers (WHO, 2010). The disseminated information can be used at different levels in the health system such as planning and policy development and as these levels require different Staff Capacity, reports should be tailor made to suit the technical experts. It is important to ensure that the dissemination of the information is done in such a way that experts in different sectors of the health system understand its relevance to their field of specialty.
The World Health Organization (2010) notes that the timing of information dissemination is crucial in determining the extent to which objectives can be met. Timing should be such that the planning cycles and the information needs of the users are met. Organizations can seek assistance from communication experts who can assist in the packaging of information. Besides communication experts, information technology offers packages that offer solutions for the provision of information to specific experts this is done to promote an information culture where the demand for information is encouraged (WHO, 2010).

### 2.5 Utilization of Results and Performance of Projects

Programs and projects may be expensive in upfront and ongoing costs and could well be competing for funding with many other projects. Policymakers should thus compare the outcomes of a program with its costs so that they can make the best choices for public investments. There are two ways to do this: cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis (Stiglitz, 2010). For a cost-benefit analysis, a common metric or indicator (money) is used to value the most significant costs and benefits for a particular project. This indicator allows for an analysis of a program or a comparison of several proposals, taking into account the time-value of money to determine the best return on the investment. The intent is to compute the monetary value of benefits and compare them to the monetary values of program costs or expenses. If a program does not achieve a minimum acceptable return of benefits to costs, then no funds should be invested. On the other hand, a cost-effectiveness analysis identifies and compares the costs of a project with some measurable outcome, without having to convert this outcome to a monetary value (Stiglitz, 2010).

For either the cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis, it is relatively easy to tackle the cost side of the equation: Fixed costs will be incurred irrespective of the size of a program: central buildings, facilities and equipment such as servers and radio/TV transmitters, central training and technical support, and infrastructure cost such satellite connections and Internet Service Provision. Variable costs are per user costs and depend on the number of users or participants in the program. These might include initial and recurring local facilities costs like computer labs, hardware costs, teaching materials, local connectivity and Internet usage, and local technical support. It is important to carry out a comprehensive analysis of all potential fixed and variable
costs for a program, since often there will be not-so-obvious costs that might have serious cash flow implications as a program unfolds (Stiglitz, 2010).

On the other side of the equation, it is often difficult to assign a monetary value to the outcomes of a project in the public sector because outcomes (such as improved test scores, increased school attendance, more competent teachers, and higher graduation rates) do not have a direct market value, as outcomes do in the private sector. Consequently, cost-benefit analysis may not be possible or appropriate. When it is used, alternative programs may be selected based on their highest net benefit, rather than the highest return on investment, since a very small project may have small benefits but even smaller costs, relative to a larger, more beneficial project (Stiglitz, 2000). Nonetheless, it is sometimes preferable in the public sector to use cost-effectiveness analysis, rather than cost benefit analysis. Thus, cost-effectiveness must take into account the many non-fiscal dimensions of a project that cannot always be put in strictly program monetary terms. As with a cost-benefit analysis, planners figure the program cost elements in monetary terms; but effectiveness (of outcomes) may be measured in other ways (Stiglitz, 2010).

2.6 Staff Capacity and Performance of Projects

The M&E system cannot function without skilled people who effectively execute the M&E tasks for which they are responsible. Therefore, understanding the skills needed and the capacity of people involved in the M&E system (undertaking human capacity assessments) and addressing capacity gaps (through structured capacity development programs) is at the heart of the M&E system (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). In its framework for a functional M&E system, UNAIDS (2012) notes that, not only is it necessary to have dedicated and adequate numbers of M&E staff, it is essential for this staff to have the right skills for the work. Moreover, M&E human capacity building requires a wide range of activities, including formal training, in-service training, mentorship, coaching and internships. Lastly, M&E capacity building should focus not only on the technical aspects of M&E, but also address skills in leadership, financial management, facilitation, supervision, advocacy and communication.

Monitoring and evaluation carried out by untrained and inexperienced people is bound to be time consuming, costly and the results generated could be impractical and irrelevant. Therefore, this will definitely impact the success of projects (Nabris, 2002). In assessment of CSOs in the Pacific, UNDP (2012) discusses some of the challenges of organizational development as having
inadequate monitoring and evaluation systems. Additionally, the lack of capabilities and opportunities to train staff in technical skills in this area is clearly a factor to be considered

Human capital training needs is paramount for reliable monitoring and evaluation, stipulating that staff working must have the necessary Staff Capacity in M & E for them to guarantee monitoring and evaluation results that are of high quality (Uitto, 2010). Employing an M & E practice that is effective requires management to selectively appoint the right skills, enhance the capacities by further developing the skill on a regular basis. The training needs assessment should be accurate, monitored and executed diligently by the team responsible for the human capital management. Project research skill in project management encourage the team to have base data for the human capital skill retention, development and enhancement (Turner, 2011). M & E practical training is important in capacity building of personnel because it helps with the interaction and management of the M & E systems. M & E training starts with the understanding of the M & E Theory and ensuring that the team understands the linkages between the project Theory of change and the results framework as well as associated indicators (Rossi, 2012). Skills are of significant importance to a monitoring and evaluation practice that is effective; the staff needs trained on the basics of evaluation.

In the context of project performance evaluations, it is necessary to have devoted and sufficient numbers of monitoring and evaluation staff, it is critical for this project evaluators to have the correct M & E skills. Professionally trained staff and a budget were a key requirement in Malawi when they were implementing the monitoring and evaluation system (Rossi, 2012). There is noted unbalanced utilization of monitoring and evaluation personnel where they mainly assign tasks other than monitoring and evaluation. This create extra burden for them to concentrate on project M & E related work. Time then becomes a challenge for them to manage the entire process completely and advocate widely for its use leading to ineffective monitoring and evaluation.

Human capital, with notable experience is vital for the achievement of M & E results. There is need for a sound M & E human resource capital in regard to quantity and quality, hence M & E human resource strategies are needed for the achievement and maintenance of a stable M & E (World Bank, 2012). Competent employees are a major obstacle in selecting M & E practices. M & E being a new tool in project management field, it faces challenges in sustainable results and
performances matrices. There is a big gap for skilled M & E professionals, capacity building of M & E systems, and harmonization of project management courses and technical support.

2.7 Theoretical Review
This section discusses the theoretical foundation on which the study is anchored. A theoretical review is a foundation for the parameters, or boundaries, of a study. Once these themes are established, studies have sought answers to the topical questions they have developed on broad subjects (Kusters, Vugt, Wigboldus & Woodhill, 2011). Therefore, this study was based on these four theories namely; theory of change, results based management theory, program theory and prospect theory.

2.7.1 Theory of Change (ToC)
Theory of Change was put forward in 1950s by Kirkpatrick’s. Theory of Change is a specific type of methodology for planning, participation and evaluation that is used in the philanthropy, not-for-profit and government sectors to promote social change. Theory of Change defines long-term goals and then maps backward to identify necessary preconditions, (Brest, 2010). Theory of Change explains the process of change by outlining causal linkages in an initiative, i.e., its shorter-term, intermediate and longer-term outcomes. The identified changes are mapped –as the outcome’s pathway – showing each outcome in logical relationship to all the others, as well as chronological flow. The links between outcomes are explained by rationales or statements of why one outcome is thought to be a prerequisite for another (Clark & Taplin, 2012).

The innovation of Theory of Change lies (1) in making the distinction between desired and actual outcomes, and (2) in requiring stakeholders to model their desired outcomes before they decide on forms of intervention to achieve those outcomes. A common error in describing Theory of Change is the belief that it is simply a methodology for planning and evaluation, (Taplin, Clark, Collins & Colby, 2013). Theory of Change is instead a form of critical Theory that ensures a transparent distribution of power dynamics. Further, the process is necessarily inclusive of many perspectives and participants in achieving solutions.

A Theory of Change can be developed retrospectively by reading Program documents, talking to stakeholders and analyzing data. This is often done during evaluations, reflecting what has
worked or not in order to understand the past and plan for the future. Therefore, this Theory will be used in relation to the monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis and M&E planning. Theory of Change can begin at any stage of an initiative, depending on the intended use. A Theory developed at the outset is best at informing the planning of an initiative. Having worked out a change model, practitioners can make more informed decisions about strategy and tactics. As monitoring and evaluation data become available, stakeholders can periodically refine the Theory of Change as the evidence indicates.

2.7.2 Results Based Management Theory

The Results-based management (RBM) Theory started with the Australian government in the mid-1980s; the Theory became increasingly important in the 1990s spearheaded by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This Theory as the name suggests is results oriented. The Results Based Management Group (RBMG) noted the evolution of the results based Theory by the preceding theories such as Public Sector Management in the 1960s, Program Management by activity in the 1970s to 1980s, Management by Objectives (MBO) and Logical Framework Approach in mid 1970s, New Public Management (NPM) and Total Quality Management (TQM) in the 1980s. RBM is one of the strategies in management. All the ground actors, supporting directly or indirectly towards the achievement of specified development results, make sure that their processes, products along with output contribute to the attainment of sustainable results (Crawford & Bryce, 2011).

RBM based on clearly defined responsibility. It defines the ultimate results and at the same time requires monitoring as well as self-assessment of progress to sustainable results, including recording performance (UNDP, 2012). RBM is a continuous approach - whose key aspects all intensify M & E elements - starting with fundamentals of detailed planning, to include setting the vision, mission and defining the framework tools based on results. Once agreed, to run a series of results through a Programme, execution starts, with monitoring now becoming a critical exercise to facilitate sustainable results attained. RBM is an ongoing process, which requires a regular feedback from the participants; the feedback supports the lesson learning a process improvement (UNDP, 2012). Main plans adjusted on a regular basis on lessons learned in the course of monitoring and evaluation. Previously used plans are adjusted and new ones established in line with the current lessons. RBM underlines monitoring as a continuing process, and lessons from
the monitoring process discussed periodically. They inform actions and decisions for the project execution. Assessments done for project continuous improvements. The implementation of the changes done for the ongoing projects as well future planned projects.

Hwang and Lim (2013) illustrated the RBM model, they paid emphasizes on monitoring as an important task in the life of a Programme or project; as a non-stop process of regular organized taxation based on stakeholder involvement, replication, criticism, data grouping, analysis of definite performance (using indicators) and periodic reporting. An imperative aspect of effective monitoring is safeguarding that information systems are established and collecting data on a consistent period. The baseline data generally collected at the beginning to show where the Programme or project performance at a given moment (Valadez & Bamberger, 2013). While monitoring essentially considered a management role and internal to the operation of a Programme or project, evaluation is independent and external role. RBM needs external endorsement of outcomes reported for it to be regarded as reliable. It focuses on the expected and achieved attainments, examining chain of results, processes, contextual factors of causality, so as to understand accomplishments or the lack thereof. According to Roberts (2010), an evaluation should offer information with evidence that is proved to be credible, reliable as well as useful, and should also enable the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations along with lessons in the decision-making process.

To enhance the usefulness of the findings along with recommendations, main stakeholders should be involved in a number of ways in the course of evaluation (Clarke, 2011). Evaluations have relevant key functions; they are but no limit to utilization, accountability, and performance. Utilization rate is a key feedback to furnish decision-makers with information along with evidence regarding project performance and existing good practices. Accountability is to project donors, funders, Government authorities, stakeholders and the common public, and contribution is for official policy-making, performance matrix and organizational effectiveness (UNDP, 2012).

At a holistic view, the Theory helps to develop performance-monitoring tools that influence the performance of the projects. The evaluations used to improve performance through the documented lessons learnt and findings. The Theory put more emphasis reporting to the stakeholders, and holding the management accountable for project outcome. The Theory focuses
on sustainable change through a well structure planning process with the use of skill labour to influence the project performance. RBM provides elements for project monitoring performance, this are linked to the variable in the current study of staff capacity in M&E as a key element directly linked to the RBM Theory. This element results to sustainable change.

2.7.3 Program Theory
The Program Theory was developed by Chen, Rossi, Patton and Weiss (1995). The focus of this Theory is on how to bring about change, and who is responsible for the change. Logical models often used to represent the Program Theory shows how the overall logic is used in an intervention. The Theory is in the body of Theory of change and applied development evaluation field. The application by the proponents to this Theory was on how to relate Program theories to evaluation for several years Weiss.

Program Theory was pragmatic tool in monitoring evaluations for many years; the Theory was famous for its conclusive mechanism to fix problems, and addresses the need to carry our assessments to compliment the findings. It also provides tools to control influential areas in evaluation (Sethi & Philippines, 2012). Quite a number of organizations’ transactions entail the human service Programs that are designed to develop the societal needs, the programs are dynamic and are subject to change based on prearranged situations. The Program Theory hence uses logical framework methodology. The Program Theory is a comprehensive version of the logic model. It presented through a graphical scale to relate to the logical model. The logical model supports the stakeholders’ engagement, senior management and review of outcomes (Hosley, 2009).

The Theory is expected and practical model on how a program hypothetical work. Lipsey (2011) stated that it is a proposition with regard to transformation of input into output. Measuring of the transformation by comparing the input and expected output. It illustrates the process program components are supposed to influence the results. Rossi (2012) argued that a Program Theory consist of an organizational plan on how to deploy resources and organize the activities of the program activities to warrant that the planned service system is established and at the same time maintained.
The Theory further helps with the funds utilizations plans, and which analyses how the target persons get the required intervention. This is through the linkages of the service delivery systems. Finally, Program Theory provides a profound information how the planned activities for specified target persons represents the expected social benefits. Uitto (2010) illustrates the benefits of using Theory-based framework in monitoring and evaluation. It includes the ability to attribute project outcomes of specific projects or activities as well as identification of anticipated and undesired program outcomes. Theory based evaluations as such enables the evaluator to understand why and how the Program is working (Rossi, 2012).

The Theory applied in the input output model to monitor performance, communicate findings and improve project performance. The M & E practices are the basic inputs when utilised well equates to the processing of the inputs and eventually give measurable output. Program Theory explains the effects of influencing the input and processes to achieve better output, and yield good results. The inputs to the process refer to the variables that influence the outcome, which is performance; in this case, the variables are the planning process, Staff Capacity, stakeholder involvement and management participation (Uitto, 2010).

The logical model clarifies the objectives of the Program identify expected casual links in following the result chain; inputs, process, outputs and the overall outcome. It provides a link to identification of performance measures at each stage of the logical model. It answers the questions of uncertainty within the project by monitoring the progress and taking corrective when diversion occurs to ensure the objectives are realised. A Program Theory shows a single immediate outcome by which the Program has achieved, it helps to understand whether there is change towards a desired performance level. Complex programs mainly found in complex projects show a series of immediate outcomes (Uitto, 2010).

Program Theory provides a conceptual framework used in developing an integrated monitoring and evaluation framework and guiding these two important project functions. Programme Theory also helps bring together available information that supports a programme providing clarity about how a programme is understood to work or not to work, thereby aiding to bridge the gap towards optimal performance (Rogers, Chappelle, Wall & Barron-Simpson, 2011). Program Theory principles may apply for a single evaluation, planning multiple evaluations of different projects that are funded under Program, or to collate data and information from multiple
evaluations both midterm and final. The Theory therefore is in relation to the M&E planning objective.

2.8 Conceptual Framework
A conceptual framework can be described as a system of thinking and objectives that lead to the establishment of a regular set of rules and standards. The purpose of the conceptual framework is to determine to what levels the dependent variable relies on the independent variables. The independent variables include M&E Planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and utilization of results while the dependent variable is the performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations as indicated in figure 1.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
2.9 Summary
This chapter has mainly looked at the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations with a global, regional and local view. Also, it has focused on theories related to the research’s objectives. It has been evident from other scholars that failure and success of a project is dependent on a sound monitoring and evaluation system which helps to keep checks and balances on the project. Monitoring and Evaluation plays a significant role in establishing the credibility of a project and enhances accountability and transparency in allocation and use of the resources. This can lead to a mutual relationship between donors and other stakeholders involved in the project.

2.10 Research Gap
There has been a number of valuable studies of performance, majority of which seems to agree that monitoring is a major contributor to performance. Most of the studies as discussed in the following paragraphs links projects performance to monitoring and evaluation. The problem is that, despite knowledge that effective monitoring practices is a major contributor to project performance; there are still project failures in Kenya. The investigation by Koffi-Tessio (2002), on Efficacy and Efficiency of Monitoring practices for Projects Financed by the Bank Group that was done in Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Kenya, Rwanda and Mozambique, through work area audit and meetings, for projects endorsed in the vicinity of 1987 and 2000.

According to Government of the Republic of Kenya (2007) on a study on conducting monitoring and evaluation training can influence project performance failed to present an understanding of what influence M&E training has on project performance. Nyonje, Ndunge and Mulwa (2012) discussed the Monitoring and evaluation planning can influence project performance which inadequately established influence of M&E plans on project performance. Nyonje et al. (2012) also found that some organizations neglect to institute M&E mechanisms on account of inadequate understanding but this study inadequately established influence of M&E on project performance. Armstrong and Baron (2012) in their study found that Project performance is understood differently and in piecemeal but didn’t validate popular understanding of project performance. A study by Waithera and Wanyoike (2015) on Influence of project monitoring and evaluation on performance of youth funded agribusiness projects in Bahati Sub-County, Nakuru found level of training of personnel, stakeholder participation and political influence play a
pivotal role in determining the performance and success of youth funded projects. However, the mentioned study did not look at how selection of M&E tools and techniques and how an M&E plan will affect or contribute towards project success.

Across these various concerns lies a common need to recognize positive results and correct course as necessary. These discussions have led to the conclusion that there is need to pay more attention to the usage of M&E systems for project efficiency, effectiveness and impact. If the FBOs can’t measure how well they are doing against targets and indicators, they may go on using resources, without changing the circumstances they have recognized as a problem at all.

Good performance of projects is realized from different project stakeholders seeing success in the same way, which should lead to concerted effort that aims to achieve a common objective. These factors vary in scope and purpose. So, they are repetitive and overlapping in nature. It is therefore impossible for a general agreement on a specific set of factors as the only factors that are responsible for the optimal performance of healthcare projects. Moreover, different factors affect projects at different stages of the project’s lifecycle. However, there could be some underlying reason(s), which appears lacking in literature responsible for projects’ success worth identifying. The many scholars have acknowledged the existence of a knowledge gap in management, skills, staff, and finances influence on implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems. This study was a step in the right direction since it tried to give an insight of influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter gives brief description of the research design target population, sampling frame and technique, research instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis. These are used to achieve the objectives of the study which is to establish the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organisations.

3.2 Research Design
This study adopted a descriptive survey. Descriptive surveys seek to describe a behaviour of a subject, the descriptive design is proposed because the study seeks to describe how different factors. According to Gorard (2013), descriptive surveys are designed to portray accurately the characteristics of individuals, situations or groups. It is used as a needs assessment tool to provide information on which to base sound decisions and to prepare the background for more constructive programmed of educational research.

3.3 Target Population
The target population of the study comprised of the management of the 47 Faith Based Organizations in Meru North Sub-County consisting of steering committee, resource officers, team leaders and project committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Officers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leaders</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project committee members</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sampling Size and Sampling Procedure
A working sampling frame was developed, which consisted of Project Officers, Project Managers and Project committee members at the sub county.
3.4.1 Sampling Size

To determine the sample size, Slovin’s formula was used to give a sample size of 186 respondents.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

Where

- \( n \) = number of samples
- \( N \) = total population
- \( e \) = 0.05 (margin of error)

\[ n = \frac{347}{1 + 347 \times 0.05^2} \]

\[ n = 186 \text{ respondents} \]

3.4.2 Sampling Procedure

The study employed stratified sampling technique. This ensured that all subgroups in the population was included in the study. Stratified random sampling technique is cited as having increased sample’s statistical efficiency and provides adequate data for analyzing the various sub population (Cooper & Schinder, 2014). To ensure adequate representation, the population was first be clustered in three main categories i.e. Project Officers, Program Managers and Project committee members. Each category was further stratified as follows: - under project officers there were steering committee, resource officers and team leaders, under Program managers there were both middle and top level managers. The sample size distribution among the respondents is as shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Officers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leaders</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project committee members</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Data collection Instruments

Research instruments refer to techniques and materials used by the study to collect information (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Primary data was obtained using self-administered questionnaires. The questionnaire was made up of closed ended questions. The closed-ended questions were enabled the researcher to collect sufficient quantitative data. This is used in order to gain a better understanding and possibly enable a better and more insightful interpretation of the results from the study.

3.6 Pretesting of Research Instruments

Pretesting of the research instruments were conducted to assess the validity and the reliability as presented in sections 3.6.1 and 3.6.2.

3.6.1 Validity of Research Instruments

The study used content validity which draws an inference from test scores to a large domain of items similar to those on the test. Expert opinion was requested to comment on the representativeness and suitability of questions and give suggestions of corrections to be made to the structure of the research tools. This helped to improve the content validity of the data that was collected. Content validity was obtained by asking for the opinion of the supervisor, lecturers and other professionals on whether the questionnaire was adequate.

3.6.2 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is consistency of measurement, or stability of measurement over a variety of conditions in which basically the same results should be obtained (Song, Coit, Feng & Peng, 2014). Cronbach’s alpha was used. Cronbach’s alpha is a measure of internal consistency, that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. It is considered to be a measure of scale reliability. A high value for alpha does not imply that the measure is one-dimensional. An alpha coefficient higher than 0.70 indicates that the gathered data has a relatively high internal consistency and could be generalized to reflect opinions of all respondents in the target population. Cronbach’s alpha (α) was computed as follows:

\[
\alpha = \frac{N \cdot \bar{c}}{\bar{v} + (N - 1) \cdot \bar{c}}
\]
Where N is equal to the number of items, c-bar is the average inter-item covariance among the items and v-bar equals the average variance.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures
The researcher obtained an introduction letter from the university was presented to the respondents. The researcher with the help of research assistants delivered the questionnaire and give the selected respondent a maximum of three days after which the researcher collected the completed questionnaire for analysis. The drop and pick method was preferred for questionnaire administration so as to give respondents enough time to give well thought out responses.

3.10 Data Analysis Techniques
Data analysis is the process of systematically searching, organizing, and breaking data into manageable units then synthesizing the data to search for patterns. Data collected from the responder was first checked for completeness and comprehensiveness. The returned and duly filled questionnaires were verified, coded and tallied. The questionnaire comprised of both open and closed ended questions.

After Data Cleaning, which entails checking for errors in entry, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data, descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, mean score and standard deviation was estimated for all the quantitative variables. The qualitative data from the open-ended questions were analyzed using conceptual content analysis and presented in prose.

Inferential data analysis was carried out by the use of multivariate regression model to determine the strength of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables. The regression equation was; 

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Where; Y= Performance of Projects

$\beta_0$ = Constant Term

$\beta_1$, $\beta_2$, $\beta_3$ and $\beta_4$. = Beta coefficients

$X_1$= M&E Planning

$X_2$= Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis
X₃ = Staff Capacity

X₄ = Utilization of results

ε = Error term

3.11 Ethical Considerations
Ethics are acceptable standards governing research conduct and influence the welfare of human being. It is about making decision, choosing the right or wrong behaviour by an individual (Ferrell & Fraedrich, 2015). The study assured confidentiality, honesty and informed consent in study methods, procedures and presentation of results ensuring that there were no falsified or misrepresentation of data.

Permission was obtained from the various interviewees before conducting interviews. The researcher took the responsibility of adhering to the principles of ethical and good practices of research such as informed consent, respecting confidentiality, voluntary participation and bring no harm to the participant. The researcher avoided accepting favours that violated research principles, and lastly avoid deceiving participants (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2018).
3.11 Operationalization of Variables

Operational variables (or operationalizing definitions) refer to how you defined and measure a specific variable as it was used in your study.

**Table 3.3: Operationalization of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Scale of measurement</th>
<th>Data analysis Technique</th>
<th>Tools of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine the influence of M&amp;E Planning on performance of projects.</td>
<td>M&amp;E Planning</td>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E Work plans/ M&amp;E Frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic planning in support of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the influence of Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis on performance of projects.</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis</td>
<td>Quality surveys Progress at various levels User friendliness Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To examine the influence of Staff Capacity on performance of projects.</td>
<td>Staff Capacity</td>
<td>Experience in M &amp; E Training needs assessments Level of education</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To evaluate the influence of Utilisation of the results and cost effectiveness on performance of projects.</td>
<td>Utilisation of the results and cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Creating of ownership M&amp;E process Making informed decisions on the future Project internal and external accountability of the resources Empowerment of</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To estimate performance of projects</td>
<td>Performance of projects</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Accessibility by locals</td>
<td>Satisfaction of customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Nominal
Descriptive statistics
Regression analysis
Correlation analysis
Questionnaire
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings obtained from the primary instrument used in the study. The study sought to establish the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. In this chapter, the study specifically presents the findings for response rate, reliability analysis, demographic information, monitoring and evaluation practices, performance of projects and inferential statistics which include the Pearson correlation and regression analysis.

4.2 Response Rate

Questionnaires were administered to sample of 186 out of which 144 were fully filled and returned. This gave a response rate of 77.4% which was within what Song, Coit, Feng and Peng (2014) prescribed as a significant response rate for statistical analysis and established at a minimal value of 50%. The findings are shown in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was done using Cronbach’s Alpha which measures the internal consistency by establishing if certain items within a scale measure the same construct. The results were as shown in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2: Reliability Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cronbach Alpha was established for each variable. The findings in Table 4.2 illustrates that all the four variables were reliable as their reliability values exceeded the prescribed threshold of 0.7. This therefore, depicts that the research instrument was reliable and therefore required no amendments. This is in line with Malhotra (2015) and Cooper and Schinder (2014) who recommended that for a variable to be reliable, the computed Cronbach Alpha should be equal or greater than the Alpha value threshold which was set at 0.7.

### 4.4 Demographic Information

This section presents general information of the respondents including gender, age, and highest education level, position in the organization and duration they have worked with projects. This general information is presented in tables.

#### 4.4.1 Gender of the Respondent

The respondents were requested to indicate their gender. The findings are as illustrated in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.3, showed that majority of the respondents were female as shown by 55.6% while the rest were male as shown by 44.4%. This shows that the study considered all respondents irrespective of the gender to collect reliable information concerning the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects.

#### 4.4.2 Age of the Respondent

The respondents were requested to indicate their age bracket. The findings for the age distribution of the respondents are as shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: Age of the Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-27 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-37 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-47 years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 47 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.4, most of the respondents indicate to be aged between 38 and 47 years as illustrated by 54.9%. Other respondents indicated to be aged between 28 and 37 years as illustrated by 24.3%, between 18 and 27 years as illustrated by 17.4% and above 47 years as illustrated by 3.5%. The study covered all the relevant age groups hence the data collected was more diverse and rich in information.

4.4.3 Highest level of Education

The respondents were requested to indicate their highest level of education. Their responses are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Respondents Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary/secondary education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.5, most of the respondents indicated to have master’s degree as shown by 41.7%. Other respondents indicated their highest level of education as undergraduate degree as shown by 34%, diploma as shown by 13.2% and primary/secondary education as shown by 11.1%. This is an indication that the collection of data cut across all the levels of education of the respondents. As a result of varied opinions among the respondents of various
levels of education, the data collected could be relied upon to ascertain the qualification of the respondents.

### 4.4.4 Respondents Position in the Organization

The respondents were further requested to indicate their position in the organization. The findings are as illustrated in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6: Respondents Position in the Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Level Manager</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Manager</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Officer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Officer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project committee members</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.6, most of the respondents indicated to be in position of steering committee as illustrated by a mean of 24.3%, top level manager as illustrated by a mean of 18.1%, resource officer as illustrated by a mean of 18.1%, middle level manager as illustrated by a mean of 16.7%, project committee members as illustrated by a mean of 13.2% and medical officer as illustrated by a mean of 9.7%. The data collected was from respondents from different positions hence their diverse opinions made the data more reliable in establishing how monitoring and evaluation practices affects performance of projects.

### 4.4.5 Duration Working with Projects

The respondents were requested to indicate duration they have worked with projects. The findings are as illustrated in Table 4.7
Table 4.7: Duration Working with Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration working with projects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.7, most of the respondents indicated that the duration they have worked with projects was 6 to 10 years as shown by 30.6%, 2 to 5 years as shown by 27.1%, less than 2 years as shown by 25.7% and others indicated that duration they have worked with projects was more than 10 years as shown by 16.7%. Therefore, since most of the respondents had worked with projects long, the data provided on various effects of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of project could be relied upon.

4.5 Descriptive Statistics

In this section, the study presented descriptive statistics for project performance, monitoring and evaluation planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, utilization of results and staff capacity. The findings for each variable are presented in the respective sections.

4.5.1 Project Performance

The respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement with the various statements on performance of projects using 1-5 Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree). The findings are as shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Performance of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects are completed on time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects are completed within the budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delivery of the projects is within the scope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is high quality delivery of the projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From the findings in Table 4.8, most of respondents strongly agreed that there is high quality delivery of the projects as shown by 50.7% and a mean of 4.340 and this means that the delivery of the projects are of high quality. Further majority of the respondents agreed that projects are completed within the budget as shown by 47.9% and a mean of 4.063 and this is indication that the completion of the projects is as per the set budget and hence no cost overruns.

Moreover, most of the respondents agreed that projects are completed on time as shown by 34.7% and a mean of 3.8056 and this means that most of the projects have been completed within the set timelines and hence this indicates that chances of time overruns are minimal. However, most of the respondents were neutral that the delivery of the projects is within the scope as shown by 54.9% and a mean of 2.6736. This means that most projects performed as per the expectations of stakeholders.

### 4.5.2 Staff Capacity

The respondents were further asked to indicate their agreement with various statements linked to staff capacity using a 1-5 Likert scale ((1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree). The findings are as shown in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff have adequate experience in monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of education is considered in selection and recruitment of staff into M&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As per the findings in Table 4.9, majority of the respondents strongly agreed that technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects as illustrated by 50.7% and a mean of 4.403. This means that in running various areas and stages of the project there is need to recruit technical experts.

Further, most of the respondents agreed that project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&E as illustrated by 52.8% and a mean of 4.236. This is an indication that there are trainings for project staff to make them more competent while conducting monitoring and evaluation.

Most of the respondents also agreed that the skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation as illustrated by 34.7% and a mean of 3.819. This means that in conducting effective monitoring and evaluation, there is a need for the staff to be skilled and more competent.

However, majority were neutral that the level of education is considered in selection and recruitment of staff into M&E team as illustrated by 44.4% and a mean of 3.056. This is an indication that while recruiting and selecting the staff to be included in the monitoring and evaluation team it’s important to consider their level of education.

In addition, most of the respondent were neutral that the staff have adequate experience in monitoring and evaluation as illustrated by 37.8% and a mean of 3.0000. This implies that staff have inadequate experience in monitoring and evaluation

4.5.3 M&E Planning

The respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement with various statements linked to M&E Planning using a 1-5 Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree). The findings are as shown in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10: M&E Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>Mean (%)</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a monitoring and evaluation plan which is up to date</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&amp;E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The monitoring and evaluation team have developed a Plans for dissemination and use of information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E planning includes description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Planning ensures effective tracking of progress of the projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.10, most of the respondents agreed that M&E Planning ensures effective tracking of progress of the projects as illustrated by 54.9% and a mean of 4.090. This means that monitoring and evaluation planning is very significant in making sure that there is effective tracking of progress of the projects. The respondents also agreed that the monitoring and evaluation team have developed a Plan for dissemination and use of information illustrated by 38.2% and a mean of 4.021. This implies that there are plans for dissemination and use of information developed by the monitoring and evaluation team. Further most of the respondents agreed that that there is a monitoring and evaluation plan which is up to date illustrated by 51.4% and a mean of 3.833. This is an indication that most of the monitoring and evaluation plan for projects are up to date.In addition, most of the respondents agreed that the M&E planning
includes description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s) illustrated by 61.1% and a mean of 3.6111. This implies that M&E planning has a description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s).

Majority of the respondents were neutral that the up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners illustrated by 86.1% and a mean of 2.8611. This means that the project stakeholders are not sure whether up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners. In overall it was found that M&E planning have an influence on performance of projects funded by faith based organizations in Meru north

4.5.4 Utilization of M&E findings

The respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement with various statements linked to Utilization of M&E findings using a 1-5 Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree). The findings are as shown in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings are utilized in establishing the progress of the projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings are utilized in identifying the challenges encountered during the M&amp;E process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings are utilized in projects to decide which stages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings points out the challenges facing every stage of M&amp;E process hence coming up with solutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings helps the management of the projects to come up with the right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strategies for implementing a successful M&E system

From the study results in Table 4.11, most of the respondents agreed that the M&E findings point out the challenges facing every stage of M&E process hence coming up with solutions as shown by 55.6% and a mean of 4.278. This this means that M&E findings are very significant as they help in unearthing the challenges faced in M&E process and also finding a solutions for them.

Further most of the respondents agreed that the M&E findings helps the management of the projects to come up with the right strategies for implementing a successful M&E system as shown by 42.3% and a mean of 4.194. This means that coming up with strategies for successful M&E system implementation the project management relies on M&E findings.

Further, most of the respondents agreed that the M&E findings are utilized in projects to decide which stages as shown by 47.9% and a mean of 4.063. This is an indication that M&E findings are significant in every project for deciding the project stage to be evaluated first.

In addition, majority of the respondents agreed that the M&E findings are utilized in establishing the progress of the projects as shown by 75% and a mean of 3.750. This means that in establishment of the state and project progress, there is a need to use the M&E findings.

However, most of the respondents disagreed that the M&E findings are utilized in identifying the challenges encountered during the M&E process as shown by a mean of 2.2014. This implies that M&E findings is not utilized in identification of challenges encountered when conducting monitoring and evaluation.

4.5.5 Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis

The respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement with various statements linked to monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis using a 1-5 Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree). The findings are as shown in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: M&E Data Collection and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis tools in place includes procedures, people,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and external assessments reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is timely dissemination of analyzed data during the M&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs and not excessive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the findings in Table 4.12, majority of the respondents agreed that there is timely dissemination of analyzed data during the M&E as illustrated by 58.3% and a mean of 4.306. This means that dissemination of analyzed data during the monitoring and evaluation is done on time.

Most of the respondents also agreed that data collection and analysis tools in place includes procedures, people, skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage M&E data as illustrated by 56.3% and a mean of 4.271. This means that data collection and analysis tools in place includes procedures, people, skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage Monitoring and evaluation data.
Moreover, most of the respondents agreed that the number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme needs and not excessive as illustrated by 83.3% and a mean of 3.722. This means that number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme needs and not excessive. In addition, most of the respondents agreed that data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation as illustrated by 50.7% and a mean of 3.618 and this is an indication that data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation.

However, most of the respondents were neutral that data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis as illustrated by 58.3% and a mean of 3.472. This means that there is no clarity whether data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis. Also, majority of the respondents were neutral that data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal and external assessments reports as illustrated by 40.3% and a mean of 2.8333. This means that there is no clarity whether data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal and external assessments reports.

4.6 Pearson Correlation Analysis

According to Ward (2013), correlation technique was used to analyze the degree of association between two variables. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the strength and the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable. The analysis using Pearson’s product moment correlation was based on the assumption that the data is normally distributed and also because the variables are continuous. The findings are as shown in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.13: Correlation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations M&amp;E planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study computed into single variables per factor by obtaining the averages of M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and Utilization of results. Pearson’s correlations analysis was then conducted at 95% confidence interval and 5% confidence level 2-tailed. Table 4.13 indicates the correlation matrix between the factors (M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and Utilization of results) and performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations.

As per Table 4.13 there is a positive relationship between performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations and M&E planning as shown by coefficient of 0.714, a positive relationship between performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations and monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis as shown by coefficient of 0.611, a positive relationship between performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations and staff capacity as expressed by coefficient of 0.522 and a positive relationship between performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations and Utilization of results as illustrated by a coefficient of 0.672. This shows all variable were significant in determining the influence of implementation of quality management system on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations.

4.7 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is applied when the study aims at establishing if a variable (independent) predicts another variable (dependent). This study sought to establish influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on the performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The findings are presented in various Tables.
Table 4.14: Regression Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, the independent variables were statistically significant predicting the dependent variable since adjusted R square was 0.768. This implied that 76.8% variations in performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya are explained by M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and utilization of results. Other institutional factors influencing performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya that were not covered in this study accounted for 23.2% which form the basis for further studies.

Table 4.145: ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>378.098</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.525</td>
<td>119.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>109.813</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>487.911</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-critical (obtained from F tables)= 2.4140

From the ANOVA Table 4.15, p-value was 0.000 and F-calculated was 119.648. Since p-value was less than 0.05 and the F-calculated was greater than F-critical (2.4140), then the regression relationship was significant in determining how M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis and staff capacity and utilization of results influenced performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya.

Table 4.15: Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>2.509</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E planning</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>2.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>2.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff capacity</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>2.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of results</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>2.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The established model for the study was:

\[ Y = 0.971 + 0.732X_1 + 0.656X_2 + 0.588X_3 + 0.677X_4 \]

Where:
- \( Y \) = Performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya
- \( X_1 \) = M&E planning
- \( X_2 \) = Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis
- \( X_3 \) = Staff capacity
- \( X_4 \) = Utilization of results

The regression equation in table 4.16 has established that taking (M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, staff capacity and utilization of results), performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya would be 0.971. The findings presented also show that increase in the M&E planning leads to 0.732 increase in the score of performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya if all other variables are held constant. The variable was significant since calculated \( t \) (2.103) was greater than table value of \( t \) (1.658). It was found that if monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis increases, there is a 0.656 increase in performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The variable was significant since calculated \( t \) (2.327) was greater than table value of \( t \) (1.658).

Further, the findings show that a unit increases in the scores of staff capacity would leads to 0.588 increase in the scores of performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya in Kenya. The variable was significant since calculated \( t \) (2.35) was greater than table value of \( t \) (1.658). The study also found that a unit increases in the scores of utilization of results would lead to a 0.677 increase in the scores of performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya in Kenya. The variables was significant since calculated \( t \) (2.518) was greater than table value of \( t \) (1.658).
Overall, M&E planning had the greatest influence on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya followed by utilization of results, then monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis while staff capacity had the least influence on the performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. All the variables were significant since their p-values were less than 0.05.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presented summary of the findings, conclusions as well as the recommendations of the study. This study focused on the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
The study sought to assess the influence of staff capacity on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. The study established that a unit increase in the score of staff capacity would lead to 0.588 increase in the scores of performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study found that technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects, that project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&E and that the skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation. Moreover, the study found that the level of education is considered in selection and recruitment of staff into M&E team and that the staff have adequate experience in monitoring and evaluation.

The study sought to assess the influence of monitoring and evaluation planning on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. The study revealed that increase in the M&E planning leads to 0.732 increase in the score of performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study established that M&E Planning ensures effective tracking of progress of the projects, that the monitoring and evaluation team have developed a Plans for dissemination and use of information and that there is a monitoring and evaluation plan which is up to date. Moreover, the study found that the M&E planning includes description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s) and the up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners.

The study sought to establish the influence of utilization of results on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. Further the study found that an increase in monitoring and
evaluation data collection and analysis would increase performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya by 0.656. The study found that the M&E findings points out the challenges facing every stage of M&E process hence coming up with solutions, that the M&E findings helps the management of the projects to come up with the right strategies for implementing a successful M&E system, that the M&E findings are utilized in projects to decide which stages and that M&E findings are utilized in establishing the progress of the projects. In addition the study revealed that the M&E findings are utilized in identifying the challenges encountered during the M&E process.

The study sought to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. The study also found that a unit increase in the score of utilization of results would lead to a 0.677 increase in the scores of performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya in Kenya. The study found that there is timely dissemination of analyzed data during the M&E, that data collection and analysis tools in place includes procedures, people, skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage M&E data and that the number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme needs and not excessive. The study also found that data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation, that data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis and that that data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal and external assessments reports.

5.3 Discussions
This section indicates the discussions of the study variables and linking them to findings of other scholars.

5.3.1 Staff Capacity and Performance of Projects
The study established that staff capacity significantly and positively influences performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study found that technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects, that that project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&E. This is in line with Turner (2011) who argued that M & E practical training is important in capacity building of personnel because it helps with the interaction and management of the M & E
systems. M & E training starts with the understanding of the M & E Theory and ensuring that the team understands the linkages between the project Theory of change and the results framework as well as associated indicators.

The study also found that the skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation. This concurs with Rossi (2012) who noted unbalanced utilization of monitoring and evaluation personnel where they mainly assign tasks other than monitoring and evaluation. This create extra burden for them to concentrate on project M & E related work. Time then becomes a challenge for them to manage the entire process completely and advocate widely for its use leading to ineffective monitoring and evaluation.

Moreover, the study found that the level of education is considered in selection and recruitment of staff into M&E team and that the staff have adequate experience in monitoring and evaluation. These findings are in line with Uitto (2010) who argued that employing an M & E practice that is effective requires management to selectively appoint the right skills, enhance the capacities by further developing the skill on a regular basis. The training needs assessment should be accurate, monitored and executed diligently by the team responsible for the human capital management. Project research skill in project management encourage the team to have base data for the human capital skill retention, development and enhancement.

5.3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Planning and Performance of Projects

The study established that M&E planning significantly and positively influences performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study established that M&E Planning ensures effective tracking of progress of the projects. This concurs with Kalali, Ali and Davod (2011) who noted that M&E plan and technology infrastructure would involve advocating for the need for M&E, assessing strategic information needs (including planning for M&E utilization dissemination), achieving consensus and commitment among stakeholders, particularly on indicators and reporting structure & tools, developing mechanism for M&E plan review, and preparing document for final approval.

The study also found that the monitoring and evaluation team have developed a Plans for dissemination and use of information and that there is a monitoring and evaluation plan which is up to date. This is in line with Golini and Landoni (2013) who argued that the monitoring team
should have the necessary basic information obtained through sufficient investigation and surveys to adequate project monitoring throughout the project lifecycle and in-depth evaluation exercise. Where all the above factors are considered, development projects such as health projects tend to have strong links between sectoral planning and project identification, /feasibility and formulation, and between project preparation/project appraisal and project implementation

Moreover, the study found that the M&E planning includes description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s) and the up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners. These findings correspond to Hermano, López-Paredes, Martín-Cruz and Pajares (2012) provided planning as plausible explanation for the success of development projects – that they are able to meet set targets due to effective planning. The process of M&E planning and implementation is able to resolve inherent challenges ranging from conceptual differences about the projects if there are well thought out and capture proper technical and economic considerations

5.3.3 Utilization of Monitoring & Evaluation findings and Performance of Projects

The study established that utilization of M&E findings significantly and positively influences performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study found that the M&E findings points out the challenges facing every stage of M&E process hence coming up with solutions. This correspond to Ebrahim (2010) who argues that success or failure of the M&E process depends on steps taken in sharing the information. The funding agencies usually form the group of important stakeholders that need feedback on the progress of the project they funded. There needs to be a balance between successes and mistakes of the project when delivering the information to the funding agencies. Those involved in the project will also need to be informed of the outcomes of the project

The study found that the M&E findings helps the management of the projects to come up with the right strategies for implementing a successful M&E system, that the M&E findings are utilized in projects to decide which stages and that M&E findings are utilized in establishing the progress of the projects. These findings are in line with WHO (2010), that the disseminated information can be used at different levels in the health system such as planning and policy
development and as these levels require different Staff Capacity, reports should be tailor made to suit the technical experts. It is important to ensure that the dissemination of the information is done in such a way that experts in different sectors of the health system understand its relevance to their field of specialty.

In addition, the study revealed that the M&E findings are utilized in identifying the challenges encountered during the M&E process. These findings concur with Stiglitz (2010). For a cost-benefit analysis, a common metric or indicator (money) is used to value the most significant costs and benefits for a particular project. This indicator allows for an analysis of a program or a comparison of several proposals, taking into account the time-value of money to determine the best return on the investment. The intent is to compute the monetary value of benefits and compare them to the monetary values of program costs or expenses.

### 5.3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis and Performance of Projects

The study established that Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis significantly and positively influences performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. The study found that there is timely dissemination of analyzed data during the M&E, that data collection and analysis tools in place include procedures, people, skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage M&E data and that the number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme needs and not excessive. This is in line with WHO (2010), that success or failure of the M&E process depends on steps taken in sharing the information. The funding agencies usually form the group of important stakeholders that need feedback on the progress of the project they funded. There needs to be a balance between successes and mistakes of the project when delivering the information to the funding agencies. Those involved in the project will also need to be informed of the outcomes of the project.

The study also found that data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation, that data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis and that that data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal and external assessments reports. The findings are in line with Ebrahim (2010) who argued that the culmination of the reporting process is the translation of gathered
data into information ready to inform decision making using formats accessible to policy makers (WHO, 2010). The disseminated information can be used at different levels in the health system such as planning and policy development and as these levels require different Staff Capacity, reports should be tailor made to suit the technical experts.

5.4 Conclusions

From the findings of the study it was concluded that staff capacity influence performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations significantly. The study deduced that technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects, that that project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&E and that that the skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation. Moreover, the study found that the level of education is considered in selection and recruitment of staff into M&E team.

The study concluded that monitoring and evaluation planning affects the performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations significantly. The study revealed that M&E Planning ensures effective tracking of progress of the projects and that there is a monitoring and evaluation plan which is up to date. In addition, the study deduced that the M&E planning includes description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s) and the up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners.

The study concluded that utilization of results positively and significantly influence performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. This was attributed to the fact that M&E findings points out the challenges facing every stage of M&E process hence coming up with solutions and that the M&E findings helps the management of the projects to come up with the right strategies for implementing a successful M&E system, that the M&E findings are utilized in projects to decide which stages and that M&E findings are utilized in establishing the progress of the projects.

The study found out that monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis influence performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations positively. The study found that there is timely dissemination of analyzed data during the M&E, that data collection and analysis
tools in place includes procedures, people, skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage M&E data and that the number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme needs and not excessive. The study also found that data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation, that data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis and that that data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal and external assessments reports.

5.5 Recommendations of the study
This section contains the recommendations of the study to policy, practice, and methodology as presented below

5.5.1 Recommendations to Policy
The study recommends that the organizations should come up with policies that support adequate training of the field staff involved in monitoring and evaluation through offer of adequate training for the requisite skills. The study recommends management in public sector to foster a systematic and routine collection of information from projects and programs in order to learn from experiences to improve practices and activities in the future and to have internal and external accountability of the resources used and the results obtained. The study recommends that there should be error correction in monitoring and evaluation in order to influence performance of project. The government should promote formulation and implementing measures that would enhance efficient monitoring and evaluation of government projects to achieve success in project performance in an effort to achieve better development and achieve vision 2030

There is therefore need for faith based organizations to make use of change request to develop reference points on what needs to be accomplished and what needs to be done to accomplish the said plans in relation to proper mapping of the projects to be implemented and during its execution by using relevant experts like people in land mapping, surveyors and architectural engineers, this will enable that proper feasibility study would have been conducted for easier project performance achievement. The state corporations can also make use of forecasting to determine the type of projects to pursue and assess the potential of the ongoing projects. Log
frames can also be used to links the project goals and objectives to the inputs and outputs required to implement the project.

5.5.2 Recommendations to Practice

The study recommends that all relevant stakeholders’ interests’ impact and influence should be enhanced in planning. As a result, it is utmost important have a monitoring plan that is set based on acceptable best practices in order to provide ‘evidence based’ project outcomes. Employees need to be well trained on selective monitoring planning practices and network diagrams and frameworks need to be made use of scheduling organization projects. As well, it is of essence for organizations to conduct stakeholder’s analysis surveys on its resources be ore it plans.

Further, the organization need to have a computerized database for storage and analysis software’s and data collection tools; have skilled personnel and progress and results review platforms and reporting templates. The study recommends for use of participatory approaches during monitoring and evaluation of projects. The study also recommends that training needs should be regularly assessed for the organization projects with regard to monitoring. There is thus need for further research on the same to establish the validity of this concept.

The study recommends that five to ten percent of the faith based organizations budget be used for M&E activities. The relevant costs included in the budget should be consistent with activities in the M&E plan. Management of faith based organizations should adequately budget for assessments of impact and outcome and identify any related technical assistance needed for conducting national program reviews and or evaluations.

Monitoring and evaluation of projects funded by faith based organizations must be carried out after every phase of implementation. This will be essential in providing information that showcases project progress. The monitoring and evaluation team should present the M&E information periodically as this was found to influence decision making.

The study recommends that the faith based organizations should enhance effective feedback in order to improving development policies, programs and practices by providing policymakers with the relevant evaluation information for making informed decisions. Management board of faith based organizations should enhance monitoring and evaluation feedbacks, enhance capacity
and response, engage stakeholders to achieve improvement in monitoring and evaluation and improve success in projects funded by faith based organizations.

5.5.3 Recommendations to Methodology
The study recommends that there is a need to adopt a descriptive research design for future studies. This is because, descriptive surveys seek to describe a behaviour of a subject, the descriptive design is proposed because the study seeks to describe how different factors. Descriptive surveys are designed to portray accurately the characteristics of individuals, situations or groups. It is used as a needs assessment tool to provide information on which to base sound decisions and to prepare the background for more constructive programmed of educational research. This study recommends use of cross sectional research design for future studies.

5.6 Suggestions for further research
This study focused on influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations in Meru North, Meru County Kenya. Studies should be done based on other sub counties in Meru County Other Than Meru North. The study also suggest the same study to be replicated in other counties in Kenya.

The study recommends an assessment of monitoring and evaluation capacities needed for an M&E Officer and an investigation into the various types of monitoring and evaluation among NGOs.

The study recommend that a further study should be carried out to determine challenges affecting training of project teams during monitoring and evaluation and find out whether training of project teams enhance project monitoring and evaluation
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter of Transmittal
EBUTHANIA SILAS KABERIA

P.O Box 3054-60200
Meru

Cellphone:

Dear Respondent,

RE: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

I am a student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a Masters of Arts degree in Project Planning and Management. As part of my final year I am required to carry out academic work in the form of a research study. I am currently conducting a study on the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of projects funded by Faith Based Organizations. The study will be guided by 6 sections which include; Personal information, M&E Planning, Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis, Staff Capacity, utilization of results and project performance. The information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will not be used for other purposes except the study. The findings of this study may be used by Program managers, The donor community, Faith Based Organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations, Government/policy makers and oversight authorities, Ministry of Planning and Vision 2030 which are key players in development projects, and other development partners to formulate policies and decision making in the region. This will lead to successful implementation of projects which will not only help the beneficiaries but also the larger community. Attached please find a questionnaire that requires you to provide information by answering questions honestly and accurately. You may not record your name anywhere in the questionnaire. Your assistance will be highly appreciated.

Thank you.

EBUTHANIA SILAS KABERIA

University of Nairobi.
Appendix II: Research Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER………………………. DATE ……/……/2019

This questionnaire is to collect data for purely academic purposes. All information will be treated with strict confidence. Do not put any name or identification on this questionnaire.

*Answer all questions as indicated by either filling in the blank or ticking the option that applies.*

**SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION**

i. Gender

[ ] Male [ ] Female

ii. Age (Years)

[ ] Below 18 [ ] 18-27 [ ] 28-37 [ ] 38-47 [ ] Above 47

iii. Highest education level

Primary/ Secondary [ ] College [ ] Diploma [ ] University [ ] Masters

iv. What is your position in the organization?

Top Level Manager [ ] Middle Level Manager [ ] Steering Committee

Resource Officer [ ] Medical Officer [ ] Project committee members

v. Duration you have worked with projects?

[ ] Less than 2 years [ ] 2-5 years [ ] 6-10 Years [ ] Over 10 years

**SECTION B: Project Performance**

9) Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on performance of projects?

Where: 1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects are completed on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70
Projects are completed within the budget
The delivery of the projects is within the scope
There is high quality delivery of the projects

**SECTION C: Staff Capacity**

1) The following statements are linked to staff capacity. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statement using a 1-5 Likert scale

Where

1= strongly disagree,  2=Disagree,  3=Neutral,  4=Agree,  5=strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Capacity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical experts are employed to run the respective areas in the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project staff are trained in order to equip them with skills necessary to carry out M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff have adequate experience in monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The skills and competence of the staff helps them to participate effectively in Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of education is considered in selection and recruitment of staff into M&amp;E team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D: M&E Planning**

8) The following statements are linked to M&E Planning. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statement using a 1-5 Likert scale

Where

1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree,  3=Neutral,  4=Agree,  5=strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E Planning</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
There is a monitoring and evaluation plan which is up to date

The up-to-date monitoring and evaluation plan indicates persons responsible for each activity, including any M&E-related roles for the programme/technical staff and implementing partners.

The monitoring and evaluation team have developed a Plans for dissemination and use of information

The M&E planning includes description of the projects covering both the problem statement and framework(s)

M&E Planning ensures effective tracking of progress of the projects

**SECTION E: Utilization of M&E findings**

The following statements are linked to Utilization of M&E findings. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statement using a 1-5 Likert scale

Where

: 1= strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilisation of results</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings are utilized in establishing the progress of the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings are utilized in identifying the challenges encountered during the M&amp;E process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings are utilized in projects to decide which stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings points out the challenges facing every stage of M&amp;E process hence coming up with solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E findings helps the management of the projects to come up with the right strategies for implementing a successful M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION F: Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis**

The following statements are linked to Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statement using a 1-5 Likert scale
Where

: 1= strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation data collection and analysis</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis tool in place is capable of identify any limitations, biases, and threats to the accuracy of the data and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis tools in place includes procedures, people, skills, and equipment necessary to systematically store and manage M&amp;E data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis tool capable of generating both internal and external assessments reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is timely dissemination of analyzed data during the M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection analysis assist in monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of data collection tools is sufficient for project/programme needs and not excessive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You.