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ABSTRACT

Monitoring and evaluation system is a fundamental tool in project management aimed at checking whether the projects’ objectives and goals are being achieved. It improves the overall efficiency of project planning, management and implementation. Many of the projects funded or initiated by donors have ended up collapsing either within the project period while others that survived the project period have not proceeded further after the termination of donor support. This has raised the questions; do these projects have a well-designed monitoring and evaluations plan to ensure effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation practices? What factors affect the design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in these projects? This study was meant to establish how financial availability, staff participation, management commitment, and relevant skills influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in HIV research projects which are mainly donor funded. The research design that was applied on this study was a survey design where a census of the target population was done using questionnaires as the instruments of data collection. Descriptive statistics was used as the method of data analysis. This study targeted KAVI project which is internationally funded and has been actively involved in research for the HIV Vaccine. About 43 respondents from KAVI were formally interviewed using structured questionnaires and only 38 respondents returned them. Briefing, rapport building and piloting of questionnaires and respondents was done and ensure their efficiency in terms of validity and reliability. The data collected was coded, keyed into SPSS (a computer software database version 13), organized, and cleaned for any errors that might have occurred during data collection. The data was then analyzed using descriptive statistics with aid of the SPSS and Microsoft Excel (computer software). Qualitative statistical techniques were used to describe and summarize data. The results were then interpreted in the form of descriptive statistics which are frequencies and percentages. The findings were presented in form of tables and figures. It was evident from the findings that management commitment is very influential to the implementation of monitoring and evaluation since they are key decision makers in an organization. Financial availability has control on the implementation because it 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 as well as to hire staff. Staff capacity both in numbers and skills are also very instrumental in any effective implementation and sustainability of monitoring and evaluation. Without relevant skills it’s hard to master the rule of any game. Therefore, the staffs need to be equipped with the relevant skills for performance and success. This study recommended that the organization look for ways of raising funds to support the monitoring and evaluation as well as make an effort to set up a monitoring and evaluation department for efficiency and accountability. The scholars will use findings of this study as a basis for further research in implementation of monitoring and evaluation in projects to bring out more understanding in this area of study.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Project management is the discipline of planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling resources to achieve specific goals. A project on the other hand 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, (Nokes, 2007). Controlling function involves three steps which define monitoring and evaluation practices; establishing standards, measuring performance against these standards, and correcting deviations from standards and plans. There has been a growing recognition that every effective project management is linked to a well-designed monitoring and evaluation system (Margoluis R., 1998). Therefore it is notable that monitoring and evaluation is integral to success of any given project.

According to Dyason (2010), Monitoring is the regular collection and analysis of information relating to a program or intervention; and Evaluation is an assessment that aims to answer specific questions about a program or intervention. All these various definitions depict monitoring as an ongoing process mainly based on the targets that are set and all the activities planned during the planning phases of work. It helps to keep the work on track, and can let management know when things are going wrong in the course of the project. If done properly, it is an invaluable tool for good management, and it provides a useful base for evaluation. It enables you to determine whether the resources you have available are sufficient and are being well used, whether the capacity you have is sufficient and appropriate, and whether you are doing what you planned to do. Evaluation as defined is more about the results/outcomes and impact of the project. It is usually an episodic assessment of the change in targeted results that can be attributed to the program or project’s interventions (Goyder, 2009). It is basically concerned on the project’s achievement where it helps the project manager to make decisions on the fate of the project. It’s about whether the goals and objectives of the project have been achieved.
Though many times the two words, monitoring, and evaluation are used interchangeably they differ in the fact that they give information about the project at its different stages. The monitoring provides an early indication of the likelihood that the expected results will be attained and provides an opportunity to validate program/project theory and logic and thus make necessary changes to improve the operations (Goyder, 2009). On the other hand the evaluation gives information about the project at specific stages as well as at its completion stage. Evaluation attempts to link a particular output or outcome directly to an intervention after a period of time has passed. Evaluation helps program or project managers determine the value or worth of a specific program or project that is its cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit of a particular program or project, (Global fund, 2004). Therefore, the processes of monitoring and evaluation are distinct but they inform each other and hence need to be systematically planned for their effectiveness.

Monitoring and Evaluation, ensures that the project/program results at levels of impact, outcome, output, process and input can be measured to provide the basis for accountability and informed decision making at both program and policy levels. Actually the Ministry of Finance (MOF) of China which is leading in the world’s economic growth expressed the keenness to strengthen mechanisms of Monitoring and Evaluation to ensure funds are well-spent (Wong, 2012). Monitoring and Evaluation was also used extensively in the USA government to measure its performance (Pfeiffer, 2011). This is indicative of the significance of Monitoring and evaluation in all nature of projects.

In the early years of the HIV and AIDS epidemic, project/program managers had little information about what interventions were likely to work in reducing the spread of the virus and little idea of how they might measure the success of their interventions beyond simply tracking HIV and AIDS (UNAIDS, 2000). As the body of knowledge surrounding HIV grows, so does the interest in monitoring and evaluating the success of the programs’ impact on the lives of families and communities. This interest comes from national governments as well from the taxpayers, program directors, and international donors who support their efforts. The need for better monitoring and evaluation has also spawned a growing data collection instruments and indicators (UNAIDS, 2000).
In recognition of the challenges posed by the AIDS epidemic, the Government of Kenya established policy guidelines in the Sessional Paper No. 4 of 1997 on AIDS in Kenya and in 1999; AIDS was declared a national disaster. A body to spearhead the coordination of interventions, the National AIDS Control Council (NACC), was created under the Office of the President to provide leadership and coordinate a multisectoral response to the epidemic (NACC, 2005). The National HIV/AIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Framework came at a time when there was increased need for accountability both to communities and development partners. With increased resources made available to respond to the epidemic, it has become mandatory for the national response to have timely and accurate data for assessing whether the interventions are making a difference and whether the resources are being used effectively to achieve the desired effect (NACC, 2005). This led to the implementation of national monitoring and evaluation system under NACC in Kenya. Conar (1996), in his survey paper about challenges facing structural fund in UK noted lack of technical staff in monitoring and evaluation, difficulties in adopting monitoring and evaluation recommendations, poor partnership in carrying out monitoring and evaluation and infrequent reporting of monitoring and evaluation results. All as formulated by these challenges undermines the performance of the projects. This was attributed to the weak monitoring and evaluation systems. It was documented that many NEPAD projects in Africa are challenged by weak monitoring and evaluation systems (Alfate and N., 2009). This report is a reflection of many devolved programs in Kenya which have not fully achieved their objectives due to the same reasons given by the NEPAD. Management hitches in most projects in Kenya were pointed out and attributed to lack of commitment from the management to allocate budget for implementation of an effective monitoring and evaluation system (UNEP, 2000; IFAD, 2002).

Organizations that had developed comprehensive strategic/operational plans seemed to have made the most progress with the regular monitoring of their work. It seemed much easier for them to meet with reporting requirements and also to reflect on their own progress meaningfully. Those organizations that had grasped and implemented such planning and monitoring systems seemed to enjoy working with them (Clarke, 2006). This is because Monitoring and Evaluation systems track what is being done and whether the project/program is making a difference. These systems allow project/program managers to calculate how to allocate resources to achieve the best overall result (UNAIDS, 2000).
Global fund (2004), acknowledges that Monitoring and evaluation is one of the cornerstones of a country’s response to fighting HIV and AIDS, TB and Malaria and strengthening health and community systems; it provides the information needed to make evidence-based decisions for program management and improvement, policy formulation, and advocacy. It also generates good-quality data to satisfy accountability requirements. Investing in strengthening a national monitoring and evaluation system is important as it will eventually save resources that may otherwise be spent in inefficient programs or overlapping activities supported by different partners. This emphasizes on the importance of a good monitoring and evaluation system toward achievement of the HIV Projects goals.

This research was designed to investigate the factors that are vital to performing a successful monitoring and evaluation. It mainly looked into the role played by management commitment, financial availability, staff capacity, and relevant skills in implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation systems. Human capacity is one of the critical components required in an HIV monitoring and evaluation system. At the individual level, it is important for people to obtain and maintain the knowledge, skills and competencies (KSC) required to carry out the variety of duties for a particular professional position or among a team of people responsible for HIV monitoring and evaluation (UNAIDS, 2008a).

1.2 Statement of the Problem
This research sought to investigate the factors that influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. It focused on the influence of management commitment, financial availability, staff capacity, and relevant skills on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system. Finances have been a major challenge in most donor funded projects. Most HIV projects are donor funded and majority of them have been terminated due to lack of funding or misappropriation of funds (IFAD, 2002). This has resulted from poor management and lack of proper tools to assess the progress or show the accountability (Worldbank, 2004). The monitoring and evaluation system when implemented is the watch dog of success of these projects. The system will work as a guiding tool to the management and also making donors gain access to the progress of the project.
From recent studies it is evident that the monitoring and evaluation results are not being utilized in the monitoring and evaluation systems in Kenya (Lehman, Friedman, and Sanders, 2004; DAC, 2005). Studies have also revealed challenges in sustainability of most projects due to lack of proper budgeting by management, lack of skills, and lack of enough staff for implementation of the monitoring and evaluation systems (Goyder, 2009; Lehman, Friedman, and Sanders, 2004). According to a study by Worldbank (2004), project finance and budgeting for the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system has equally been a major concern and has led to poor sustainability of community based projects in Kenya. There is a big knowledge gap that is required in monitoring and evaluation skills, budget and staff capacity to effectively implement the monitoring and evaluation systems in Kenya. This study highlighted the influence of management, finances, skills, and staff capacity in implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to establish the factors that influence the implementation of effective monitoring and evaluation in HIV research project at KAVI.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
These objectives formed the basis of this research:

1. To determine the extent to which management commitment stimulates the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI
2. To establish how financial availability controls the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI
3. To determine the extent to which the staff capacity affects the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI
4. To evaluate how relevant skills influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI
1.5 Research Questions

1. In what ways does management commitment stimulate the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI?

2. To what extent does financial availability control the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI?

3. What is the effect of the staff capacity on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI?

4. What is the influence of relevant skills on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation at KAVI?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will add to the body of knowledge to scholars in the area of project management especially in the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems. It will also provide the stakeholders with information on how to set-up and implement monitoring and evaluation systems that will be strong by avoiding the mistakes that will be pointed out in the study. The findings will give insight to most of the HIV projects’ researchers to the improvement and sustainability of these projects which contribute significantly to the community. The project managers, project staff, and the donors will be able to acknowledge any gaps that exist in their monitoring and evaluation system which if looked at could lead to improvement in their project achievements. The academicians, policy planners and researchers will also benefit by getting new areas of study and improvements.

Overall, the study recommendations will improve effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation in HIV and AIDS projects and provide comprehensive guidance on how to set up and implement a monitoring and evaluation system by avoiding the pitfalls that may lead to its failure. The study will also help the government to work on their policies which will enhance support to effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV and AIDS Research projects.
1.7 Assumptions of the Study
The study assumed that the sample population chosen would voluntarily participate in the study and be honest in their reporting. It also assumed that the respondents would be able to understand the questions in the questionnaires and respond objectively.

1.8 Limitation of the Study
The key challenge of the study was time since it had to be conducted and be finished within the stipulated duration by the university to allow for the graduation. Due to limited resources and time the scope of the study was limited to only one HIV research project. However the study mainly involved more research assistants and decided to work overtime to ensure data was collected and analyzed in the shortest time possible.

1.9 Delimitation of the Study
This study focused on monitoring and evaluation of HIV and AIDS projects at KAVI. KAVI runs as an independent internationally funded project based in both Kenyatta hospital and at Kangemi City Council Health Centre.

1.10 Definitions of significant terms used in the Study

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Ensuring that the project/program results at levels of impact, outcome, output, process and input can be measured to provide the basis for accountability and informed decision making at both program and policy levels.

**HIV Research Projects:** These are projects which are mainly involved in the research of the HIV and AIDS at different capacities like Vaccine development, Anti-retroviral therapy, HIV management, and care among others.

**Kenya AIDS Vaccine Initiative (KAVI):** This is an internationally funded organization which is involved in the HIV Vaccine research.
Factors Influencing Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation: These are factors which in one way or another are thought to have control on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation.

1.11 Organization of the Study
This study starts with Chapter One which is the introduction of the study and introduces the background of the study, shows the objectives, and research questions. It also narrates the literature of the study and the conceptual framework in Chapter Two. The third chapter shows the research methodology and Chapter Four presents data, analysis it and interprets tables. The study ends with the last chapter showing summary of findings, discussions, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The chapter is mainly dealing with three aspects of review that is the main review, critical review and summary of the literature review as far as the research topic is concerned. The significance of the monitoring and evaluation in HIV projects is discussed. This chapter contains literature which is related to the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV and AIDS projects in Kenya. The aim of this chapter is to focus on the review of literature with regard to the study variables and identify any gaps in the area. The independent variables will be discussed extensively and their relation to the study dependent variable. The literature on management commitment and how it stimulates the implementation of monitoring and evaluation as well as how availability of finances control the implementation of monitoring and evaluation will be discussed. The literature on staff capacity as an independent variable to the implementation of monitoring and evaluation will be extensively discussed. The relevant skills are another independent variable whose influence on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation will be looked at in this chapter.

2.2 Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation (M& E) in HIV Research Projects.
Effective monitoring and evaluation of community development programs can improve management, accountability, participation, trust, learning, and efficiency and development impacts (Görgens, Nkwazi, and Govindaraj, 2005). Monitoring and evaluation is a vital tool of management in any development project. It starts right from the planning stage of the project cycle (Khan, 2003). The impacts of HIV and AIDS in most developing countries have become important on social and economic development issues (World Bank, 2002). It is important for any country program aimed at addressing these issues to have an effective monitoring and evaluation system to ensure efficient delivery of services with intended outcome and sustainability of the program/project benefits, and policy implementation leading to the envisioned change (Khan, 2003). Monitoring and evaluation is a powerful management tool that can be used to improve the way governments and private organizations achieve results. It
provides the information needed to make evidence-based decisions for project management and improvement, policy formulation, and advocacy (Psarras, Papakonstantinou, and Metaxiotis, 1999). It also generates good-quality data to satisfy accountability requirements. Investing in strengthening a national monitoring and evaluation system is important as it will eventually save resources that may otherwise be spent in inefficient programs or overlapping activities supported by different partners (Global fund, 2004).

A mature and sustained monitoring and evaluation system has the potential to lead the organization towards meeting its responsibilities and achieving its goals, even when faced with socio-political crises that mar the development sector so often (IFAD, 2002). Monitoring and evaluation system has been used to contribute a great deal in revealing the financial accountability, measuring the success against objectives, funder requirements, quality assurance, and benchmarking measurement of customer satisfaction among others (Langi, 2008). The system can also serve as an early warning system for potential problems and lead to ideas for potential remedial actions (Khan, 2003). The conceptual design of monitoring and evaluation system is supposed to address the issues with regard to the objectives of the system, the competent authority, credibility of information, its management, dissemination and recycling into the planning process (Khan, 2003). Program/project monitoring and evaluation has the potential to be a cornerstone of health systems strengthening and of evidence-informed implementation and scale-up of HIV-related services in resource-limited settings (Nash, et al., 2009).

The research which was conducted in Niger, Benin and Cameroon by World Bank helped in development of basic approach towards an effective implementation of community based monitoring and evaluation system (World Bank, 2000). It includes a system for its use and the operational tools to use in facilitating to its sustainability (World Bank, 2000). The findings were intended for trainers and development workers with aim of introducing of monitoring and evaluation system in their projects and programs for their sustainability (World Bank, 2000). The World Bank suggested that monitoring and evaluation would be of little or no use if it is not consistently supported by all the stakeholders towards addressing the sustainability issues of the projects (World Bank, 2000). The donors, project managers, and staff must all actively participate in the implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system for its effectiveness and
sustainability (Dyason, 2010). They must support its use (Kusters, Vugt, Wigboldus, and Woodhill, 2011), and must fully understand its significance (Clarke, 2006).

Implementation of Monitoring and evaluation is intrinsically challenging and requires a level of technical capacity often unavailable in developing countries. The challenge is greater in poorer countries and in most post-conflict situations (IFAD, 2002). The reality is, many countries lack the required capacity (IFAD, 2002). Equally, there is a realization that the development and institutionalization of a monitoring and evaluation system is a major, long-term endeavor, and that there is not a single correct way to go about building a monitoring and evaluation system. According to (DAC, 2005), annual evaluation reports says that donors are facing challenges from the inefficient reporting and delays caused by many organizations in developing countries.

The monitoring and evaluation systems once implemented in a project they should be utilized well. It is very important for the implementers to know the purpose for which they are implementing the systems (Dyason, 2010). It is important to monitor and evaluate for a purpose and not for the sake of doing it. Even worse can be situation where an external or agency supporting the project initiative insists there should be monitoring and evaluation process in place, without anyone involved really knowing why (UNDP, Who Are the Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook, 1997). Such initiatives, while satisfying the interests of the donors, may have little or no real benefit for the intended beneficiaries. As much as monitoring and evaluation is to be used for corrective action, it should not be used as a way of negatively criticizing performance through a punitive management structure. Managers and key stakeholders should make it clear from the outset that they are not using monitoring and evaluation process to criticize individual performances, but rather as part of a package of activities designed to achieve a specific goal in attaining quality results from the project (Khan, 2003). In recent years, many low- and middle-income countries have established dedicated (or vertical) monitoring and evaluation systems for their HIV programs. The anticipated aims of such monitoring and evaluation systems have however not been realized in many countries due to low financial investment in monitoring and evaluation infrastructure, weak or ill-defined systems for collection, analysis, and dissemination of HIV data, inadequately trained data collectors, and insufficient technical capacity to transform HIV data into usable indicators (Kawonga, 2012).
2.2.1 Tools of M&E in HIV Research Projects.

In a successive implementation, use and sustainability of a monitoring and evaluation systems there are various tools that are used. These tools mainly include Project Delivery Report which is primarily used for budgeting and estimated expenditures and budget revisions, if necessary; Project Work Plans used to implement and review project strategy and plan resource use, establish benchmarks and monitor early warning signals that will permit actions when progress is off target; A log frame or logical framework which shows the conceptual foundation upon which the project’s monitoring and evaluation system is built. Basically, the log frame is a matrix that specifies what the project is intended to achieve objectives and how this achievement will be measured by indicators (Chaplowe, 2008; UN-HABITAT, 2003); Focus Group Meetings which may be organized by project manager and/or executing agency periodically. Used to adapt strategy to ongoing needs and to share up-to-date results on project implementation (UN-HABITAT, 2003); Annual Project Report its used to share progress with staff and other stakeholders or steering mechanisms, used to monitor progress against plans (UN-HABITAT, 2003), among others.

These tools are the backbone of this study since there is need for management commitment in the accessing and proper use of each tool to produce the expected results. There should be enough finances to cater for these tools and ensure their sustainability through effective training of the personnel to use them. However, in most projects there is little being done towards implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system which is impact driven (DAC, 2005). In most cases the practice of monitoring and evaluation is a routine process with no much expected from it (Kusters, Vugt, Wigboldus, and Woodhill, 2011), and is a way of pleasing donors (Worldbank, 2004) and the production of quality results is not seen (UNDP, 2002). There is no allocation of staff specific to the monitoring and evaluation department and thus the level of specialization is low (Chaplowe, 2008; UN-HABITAT, 2003). There is need for management to show commitment towards implementing a strong and sustainable monitoring and evaluation system for effectiveness of their projects (World Bank, 2000). This will eventually lead to the allocation of proper budget to cater for the enormous monitoring and evaluation needs (Khan, 2003), leading to trained staff with relevant skills for monitoring and evaluation (IFAD, 2002).
Thus there will be effective use of the monitoring and evaluation tools and thus success of the system.

2.3 Management commitment and the implementation of M&E in HIV Research Projects

The project management as earlier noted is the discipline of planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling resources to achieve specific goals (Nokes, 2007). The project management is the backbone of the project, through their actions and moves they determine the direction of the project. They have the right and responsibility to know what is happening in the program or project, which aspects need corrective action, what the results are expected, and which lessons can be learned and shared with one another, but they should not simply be recipients of monitoring and evaluation reports (Langi, 2008). One effective way for management to contribute to the achievement of program or project’s objectives is to be directly involved in the monitoring and evaluation process - in the formulation of critical questions and in the collection and analysis of data. This enables them to participate directly in the assessment of the relevance, performance, and success of the program or project and in recommending how to improve the quality of current and future interventions (UNDP, Who Are the Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook, 1997). This is very critical process and thus they are required to be fully equipped in the skills of monitoring and evaluation.

The World Bank’s internal evaluation unit has found that most community based projects based in Africa have performed better than the region’s other projects as a whole (World Bank, 2002). Yet only one in the five of these communities based projects, had a likelihood of sustainability (World Bank, 2002). This is because they lack an efficient monitoring and evaluation system (IFAD, 2002). Normally, project managers and program officers do carry out some monitoring activities as part of their overall work and from time to time evaluate their operations (Khan, 2003), though this process is not formal (World Bank, 2000). It does not aim to make any interventions on the project progress. It is instead, a tool for building communities’ capacity to direct their development and sustainability (World Bank, 2002). There are some common problems that have been identified to be facing the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. These mainly include; inadequate understanding of and attention to monitoring and evaluation in project design, inadequate resources both in terms of finances and human resource, lack of skills
in monitoring and evaluation which makes it hard to identify and interpret the indicators, lack of commitment by the management and the project staff (IFAD, 2002; UNDP, 2002). This leads to delay in implementation of the system and a lack of information use by the project managers (IFAD, 2002). Monitoring and evaluation is also seen as an obligation imposed from exterior, with project staff mechanically completing forms and project managers seeing the task as merely the collection of data and writing of reports for donors (Worldbank, 2004). At times irrelevant and poor quality information is produced through monitoring and evaluation as it focuses only on the physical and financial aspects and ignores factors such as project’s outreach, effect and impact (Khan, 2003).

According to (McLaughlin and Jordan, 1999), choosing what to measure, collecting and analyzing the data necessary for improvement measurement is new to many managers. However, establishing relevant monitoring and evaluation indicators will set the standard to measure their achievement. Indicators for use in monitoring and evaluation should be selected during the formulation stage of a program or project when the objectives are being established (UN-HABITAT, 2003). Monitoring and evaluation indicators identified during implementation, should enable the assessment of processes, outcomes, and impact, providing a reliable evaluation of the success or failure of a project or a program (Nash, et al., 2009). Ideally, indicators should highlight key elements of change that can be attributed to program activities. Indicators should be readily available from existing data sources or should be possible to obtain on a regular basis at low cost. Efforts should be made to ensure that the indicator is well defined, easy to collect, easy to interpret, and capable of demonstrating changes over time. Thus skills in monitoring and evaluation are vital in its implementation process (UNEP, 2000).

The data and information collected during monitoring and evaluations constitute a critical foundation for action by program managers and stakeholders, who need to be able to identify evolving problems and decide on crucial strategies, corrective measures, and revision to plans and resource allocations pertaining to the activities in question (Margoluis R., 1998). Even after completion of a project, monitoring and evaluation can contribute significantly to decision making. For instance, the terminal reports, considered as part of the monitoring function, can contain recommendations for follow-up activities (UNDP, 2002).
A critical task in the design of a monitoring and evaluation system is to identify the information needs of stakeholders (Kusters, Vugt, Wigboldus, and Woodhill, 2011). This guides management in project strategy, ensure effective operations and meet external reporting requirements. Research managers have to decide on how to gather and analyze the information as well as document a plan for a monitoring and evaluation system (Goyder, 2009). Setting up a monitoring and evaluation system in a participatory way is desirable because it helps to build stakeholders’ understanding of the project and creates a learning environment by sharing understanding of terminology and action, develop a framework, approach or system that is designed within the institutional context, standardize data collection to ensure that results are valid and comparable (Khan, 2003). Participatory monitoring and evaluation is a process through which stakeholders at various levels engage in monitoring or evaluating a particular project, program or policy, share control over the content, the process and the results of the monitoring and evaluation activity and engage in taking or identifying corrective actions.

Though monitoring and evaluation implementation have significant cost, time and human resource implications, they are very vital for successful projects and should not be overlooked at the beginning of the process (WHO, 2012). It is then essential to ensure that management personnel and donor agencies understand and are fully committed to these overheads, as well as being committed to take forward the recommendations resulting from monitoring and evaluation (Dyason, 2010). It should also be ensured that those involved in the process are appropriately trained and understand the importance of evaluation (Worldbank, 2004). It is essential that the implementers understand the methods and reasoning behind the monitoring and evaluation techniques that they are employing (Ober, 2012). It is equally important that program implementers accept responsibility for the processes used, are fully committed to them, and feel empowered to convince all other stakeholders of their short and long-term benefits (UNAIDS, 2008). Monitoring and evaluation is not an exercise that can be safely left to ad consultants from the ‘‘head office’’ (Ober, 2012). As many stakeholders as possible should be involved both in implementing and conducting the monitoring and evaluation. This requires significant effort at an initiative’s inception in identifying who the key target groups will be in the implementation, as well as understanding what anticipated outcomes are desired for each of these groups. In addition to improving quality and the likelihood of sustainability, this approach creates awareness and helps to build capacity (Khan, 2003).
The findings of monitoring and evaluation should be disseminated so that others can benefit from the experiences (Kusters, Vugt, Wigboldus, and Woodhill, 2011). It is all easy once an evaluation has been undertaken for it to be filed away and be forgotten. Apart from minimizing any practical impact on the learning environment, it will also prevent stakeholders or those interested in undertaking a similar project/program in the future from learning from the successes and mistakes recorded. The monitoring and evaluation tools created during implementation should allow the possibility of supporting not only the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals), but also effective strategies that work. This mainly involves use of internationally developed monitoring and evaluation tools that can provide important ways to compare and contrast results (WHO, 2012). This should therefore be put to consideration during the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation.

Situation analysis of human and organisation capacity in monitoring and evaluation in Guyana established lack of well-defined mandate for the monitoring and evaluation unit of the National AIDS Commission to be recognized as the coordinator of relevant stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation, leading to a lack of commitment from management to contribute to National HIV monitoring and evaluation system (UNAIDS, 2008a). The management of any individual project is the driving forces for project actions and reactions. They are typically highly active in the project execution because the result of the project affects their bottom line as much as it does for the business (Chaplowe, 2008). The implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in any project is dependent on the management commitment (Dyason, 2010). The project managers must show a lot of interest in having an active monitoring and evaluation department.

Wide participation in monitoring and evaluation is critical because diverse stakeholder groups are working towards overlapping but not precisely the same goals. The managers who set the vision and the prioritized results to realize that vision during the planning stage have the best ideas on how the results would continue to remain relevant to them (UNDP, 2002). They must therefore be involved in identifying the information or feedback that is needed during implementation, which determines the parameters for monitoring and evaluation. Having set the vision, priority results, and initial parameters for monitoring and evaluation, the key stakeholders are best placed to ensure that the programmatic initiatives planned would deliver what was intended and the way it was intended. It is important that all monitoring and evaluation
stakeholders agree on the priorities to ensure that everyone is committed to addressing them, in many cases agreeing on priorities will require them to make difficult choices (UNAIDS, 2008a).

Management participation in monitoring and evaluation implementation can produce effective communication for various other objectives. These include facilitating communication of ‘early wins’ to increase support and enlist engagement of those who are not yet engaged, ensure access of early products and services of initiatives for intended beneficiaries, mobilize additional resources to fill resource gaps, and ensure effective use of lessons learned in future decision-making (Chaplowe, 2008). Management participation throughout the programming cycle ensures ownership, learning, and sustainability of results. Continued stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation cannot be assumed. It must be institutionalized. Specific measures have to be built into program and project management processes to ensure continued and effective involvement of stakeholders (UNDP, A handbook of Monitoring and Evaluation for results, 2002)

Management involvement enhances the credibility of the evaluation process and ensures increased acceptance of the findings. A strong results-management process aims to engage other stakeholders in thinking as openly and creatively as possible about what they want to achieve and encourage them to organize themselves to achieve what they have agreed on, including putting in place a process to monitor and evaluate progress and use the information to improve performance (UNDP, Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results, 2009). The management plays a big role in budget allocation. Being the key decision makers in a project, they contribute significantly in deciding what should be given a priority in the budget. It calls for their commitment to the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system. It is through this they will be able to look into it that adequate budget is set aside for this endeavor. However most project in Africa and other developing countries have suffered a great deal due to lack of budget to implement monitoring and evaluation systems (IFAD, 2002). Most managers show little or no interest at all in the implementation of active monitoring and evaluation system (World Bank, 2000).

According to WHO (2012), the management involvement is of paramount importance, though it has various challenges such as; Unequal importance placed on the value of monitoring and
evaluation across stakeholders, Lack of consensus on important terminology, Difference in approaches to monitoring and evaluating, Asymmetry in interests for each monitoring and evaluating project, and Lack of proper funding and resources allocation (Bell, 2012). These challenges if not well managed may affect the implementation of effective monitoring and evaluation system. However, there are suggested strategies to overcome these challenges which are; Socialization, Coordination, Management of Political Interests, Development of User-Friendly Tools and Formalization (Bell, 2012).

2.4 Financial Availability and the Implementation of M&E in HIV Resarch Projects.
National monitoring and evaluation systems in resource-limited settings tend to be chronically challenged, with persistently incomplete reporting and inaccurate data posing a major threat to their utility (Kawonga, 2012; IFAD, 2002). Reasons include competing priorities and limited resources for collection and use of data; inadequate training of data collection personnel; lack of timely feedback of useful data to those in a position to improve programs; outmoded, duplicative, or irrelevant indicators; lack of proper reporting tools like registers and forms; poor documentation of services provided within health facilities; and overly onerous reporting requirements (Nash, et al., 2009). An effective monitoring and evaluation system is more than a statistical task or an external obligation (Worldbank, 2004). Thus, it must be planned, managed, and provided with adequate resources (UNAIDS, 2008a). Situation analysis of human and organisation capacity in monitoring and evaluation in Guyana revealed a range of limitations to the monitoring and evaluation system performance including both technical and organisational. The primary barrier towards implementation of an effective monitoring and evaluation system is said to be finances (UNAIDS, 2008a).

Financial resources for monitoring and evaluation should be estimated realistically at the time of planning for implementation of monitoring and evaluation (UNDP, Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results., 2009). The availability of finances will determine what can be achieved as far as implementation, strengthening and sustainability of monitoring and evaluation system is concerned (UNAIDS, 2008a). A key function of planning for monitoring and evaluation is to estimate the costs, staffing, and other resources needed for monitoring and evaluation work. It is important for monitoring and evaluation specialists to
weigh in on monitoring and evaluation budget needs at the project design stage so that funds are allocated specifically to the implementation of key monitoring and evaluation tasks (Chaplowe, 2008). Program managers often ask what proportion of a project’s budget should be allocated to monitoring and evaluation. There is no set formula; various donors and organizations recommend that between 3 to 10 percent of a project’s budget should be allocated to monitoring and evaluation (IFAD, 2002). A general rule of thumb is that the monitoring and evaluation budget should not be so small as to compromise the accuracy and credibility of results, but neither should it divert project resources to the extent that programming is impaired (Chaplowe, 2008).

The study that was conducted by World Bank on finance and budgeting of monitoring and evaluation, in their community evaluation study states that capacity building activities may have to be included in the project design to support the emergence of a more favorable environment for participation and for learning within the organization (Worldbank, 2004). This is particularly important in contexts that are less open to dissent and a frank exchange of ideas. But over a time, the project monitoring and evaluation process has to become self-sustaining at the local level. Local people have to be funded and trained in facilitation and advocacy skills, in order to be able to convince appropriate for a that certain constraints are beyond their powers to change in a bid to sustain projects. This evolution should be part of the building plan (Worldbank, 2004). It is noted that most projects though know value of monitoring and evaluation, show no aggressiveness in implementation of monitoring and evaluation system (Dyason, 2010). This is partly due to the strict budget from donors (Foundation, 1998) as well as lack of commitment from the management to allocate budget (Goyder, 2009). The failure of most HIV research projects is mainly as a result of lack of funding for proper mechanisms to monitor progress (Khan, 2003). In most of these projects there is no clear budget for the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems (Conar, 1996), though there is enough funding. There seems to be little knowledge on the management side that availability of finances is vital to implementation of monitoring and evaluation system in their projects (DAC, 2005). They lack to know that the finances control the various practices of monitoring and evaluation. It is observed that most of the monitoring and evaluation systems are implemented from budget from other sources and not its own budget (Khan, 2003). This has led to poor performance of the system and thus lack of its sustainability (Chaplowe, 2008) leading to failure of most of these projects.
Financial availability is the stronghold of implementing a strong and effective monitoring and evaluation (Global fund, 2004). IFAD (2002), in its report noted that most developing countries are being faced with the challenge of implementing a sound monitoring and evaluation due to lack of control on their funding. Therefore, the donors need to put more emphasises on the establishment of sound monitoring and evaluation systems through factoring this in the funding (World Bank, 2002). This is the only way to ensure that most of these projects realise their goals and leave a sustainable impact on the society.

2.5 Staff capacity and the implementation of M&E in HIV projects.

Inadequate staff leads to poor quality monitoring and evaluation. To ensure effective and quality monitoring and evaluation, it is critical to set aside adequate human resources at the planning stage. The required staff for monitoring and evaluation should be considered within the overall costs of delivering the agreed results and not as additional costs (UNDP, Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results., 2009). For monitoring and evaluation to be effective there is need for human, material, and financial resources. Monitoring and evaluation in most projects is not working because of poor or insufficient capacity especially in the poor and developing countries (World Bank, 2002). Sufficient allocation of staff is vital for developing effective monitoring and evaluation systems (DAC, 2005). For an effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation there is need for skilled personnel who can fulfill the monitoring and evaluation functions. These tasks mainly include designing the general outline of monitoring and evaluation system, setting up and operating supportive computerized system, facilitating learning in reflective events and managing communication of the monitoring and evaluation findings (Dyason, 2010).

There is poor use of participatory and qualitative monitoring and evaluation methods due to limited capacity and little recognition of the need for such methods. There is monitoring and evaluation documentation which does not address or identify the problem. The monitoring and evaluation staffs have insufficient relevant skills and experiences and are making little effort to fill the gap (Worldbank, 2004). For monitoring and evaluation to be effective it needs to be positioned as far more than a technical instrument for change. It is not enough to create a highly trained evaluation capacity and expect that organizations and systems will eventually become more effective. This is particularly true in situations where a broad-based and systematic approach to monitoring and evaluation had not previously existed, as in the case of many
developing countries. There is also a need to address the institutional capacity and indeed drivers that are generating the demand for evaluation. (Lehman, Friedman, and Sanders, 2004).

Key principles to keep in mind when setting monitoring and evaluation priorities are paying close attention to human resources. Adequately trained staff with dedicated time for monitoring and evaluation is critical. The ability to draw on technical assistance, when and where needed, is equally important (UNAIDS, 2008a). Human capacity is a major constraint to monitoring and evaluation in many countries. While monitoring and evaluation units or committees do exist in many national programmes, they are generally dramatically understaffed and their work is often limited to managing sero-surveillance systems (UNAIDS, 2000). Capacity building is vital if monitoring and evaluation systems are to be strengthened. If capacity cannot be maintained within the national programme, networks can be created to access outside skills as necessary. At a minimum, monitoring and evaluation units should have access to an epidemiologist, a statistician, a social scientist and a data manager. Since available data are often poorly packaged and communicated, the team should also include a professional communications specialist/lobbyist (UNAIDS, 2000).

Human capacity is one of the critical components required in an HIV monitoring and evaluation system (Fund, Monitoring and Evaluation Tool Kit:HIV, Tuberculosis, Malaria and Health and Community Systems Strengthening, 2011). In the context of monitoring and evaluation, there are several terms that are used for human capacity building such as monitoring and evaluation training, education and human resource development for monitoring and evaluation (UNAIDS, 2008a). Sufficient numbers of adequately trained staff who have dedicated time for monitoring and evaluation responsibilities is perhaps the most critical factor in the functioning of a National monitoring and evaluation system (Peersman et al, 2009). There is an emphasizes to ensure adequate skilled human resources at all levels of the monitoring and evaluation system which will ensure completion of tasks defined in the costed monitoring and evaluation work plan. This requires sufficient analytical capacity to use the data and produce relevant reports (Fund, Monitoring and Evaluation Tool Kit:HIV, Tuberculosis, Malaria and Health and Community Systems Strengthening, 2011).

Staffing is a special concern for monitoring and evaluation work because it demands special training and a combination of research and project management skills (Worldbank, 2004). Also, the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation work often relies on assistance from staff and
volunteers who are monitoring and evaluation experts. Thus, capacity building is a critical aspect of implementing good monitoring and evaluation work (Chaplowe, 2008).

2.6 Relevant Skills and the Implementation of M&E in HIV projects.
Skills are of paramount importance to an effective monitoring and evaluation, the staff need to be trained on the basics of evaluation (Bailey and Deen, 2002). Not only is it necessary to have dedicated and adequate numbers of monitoring and evaluation staff, it is essential for this staff to have the right skills for the work. Professionally trained staff and a budget were a key requirement in Malawi when they were implementing the monitoring and evaluation system (Görgens, Nkwazi, and Govindaraj, 2005). There is noted inappropriate utilization of monitoring and evaluation staff where they are frequently assigned to tasks other than monitoring and evaluation. Time then becomes insufficient for them to build the system completely and advocate widely for its use leading to effective monitoring and evaluation (Görgens, Nkwazi, and Govindaraj, 2005). Therefore, there should be clear allocation of duties to ensure that there are qualified staff set aside to conduct and control the monitoring and evaluation system for achieving quality results. This will make them to be committed leading them to work towards achieving the set priorities and goals.

2.7 Theoretical Framework
Successful monitoring and evaluation must build on appropriate and relevant baseline studies that provide the basis for comparative accounts of the impact that any has initiated (Kusters, Vugt, Wigboldus, and Woodhill, 2011). This cannot be done after the event and neither can it necessarily be done cheaply. It is therefore essential for sufficient funding to be in place at the start of any such initiative so that a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program can be implemented from the beginning. The allocation of funds is also an indication that those supporting or proposing the initiative are also really committed to seeing it through effectively. To monitor and evaluate a project/program, it is important to understand the underlying theories of change since they reveal how project designer’s and implementer’s envisioned activities contributing to expected results (Davies, 2004). The Theory of Change advocates that a program should have assumptions to explain how activities will produce a change that contributes to the achievement of the output, how outputs will produce a change that contributes
to the achievement of the outcome and how outcomes will produce a change that contributes to
the achievement of the overarching goal. It requires the demonstration of program causal
pathways (Bell, 2012). Theory(s) of change in its simplest form can be defined as , ‘‘we believe
if we do action (x) then we will achieve (y)”’. It articulates the intended activities and the
intended change (Ober, 2012). When we articulate the theories of change underlying our work,
we make them available for examination through the monitoring and evaluation. Therefore, this
theory of change should be developed at the critical project designing stages by the beneficiaries,
implementers and project partners or stakeholders (Ober, 2012). It is difficult to make decisions
on allocation of resources in a project based on past evidence of effectiveness. Reports of the
inability of aid organisation to know what it is doing may hinder the ability to make effective
claims for additional public funding (World Bank, 2000).

In recent years, many low- and middle-income countries have established dedicated or vertical
monitoring and evaluation systems for their HIV programs. The anticipated aims of such
monitoring and evaluation systems have however not been realized in many countries due to
low financial investment in monitoring and evaluation infrastructure, weak or ill-defined systems
for collection, analysis, and dissemination of HIV data, inadequately trained data collectors,
and insufficient technical capacity to transform HIV data into usable indicators (Kawonga, 2012)
2.8 Conceptual framework

**Independent variables**

- Management commitment
  - Staff capacity building
  - Budget allocation
  - Staff allocation

- Financial Availability
  - M&E budget
  - Staff capacity building
  - M&E department

- Staff Capacity
  - Level of education
  - Skills in M&E
  - Number of staff in M&E department

- Relevant Skills
  - Level of participation in M&E
  - M&E skills
  - Professional qualifications
  - M&E meetings attended

**Dependent Variable**

- Implementation of M&E in HIV Projects
  - Effectiveness
  - Transparency
  - Utilization of resources

**Moderating Variable**

**Government policy**

**Figure 1: Conceptual framework**

2.8.1 The interpretation of the conceptual framework

The conceptual framework shows the relationship between four independent variables: management commitment, financial capacity, knowledge and skills and staff capacity and how they affect or influence the dependent variable: implementation of monitoring and evaluation. For an effective monitoring to take place the management commitment is very important since the project managers are the key decision makers and thus are the people involved in implementing the findings. The implementation of monitoring and evaluation is highly
dependent on the availability of finances to facilitate and sustain the process. The staff should be adequate and well trained in monitoring and evaluation skills. They help in carrying out continuous monitoring and evaluation through field visits and other duties relevant to the process in the whole of project life. The project monitoring and evaluation is influenced by management commitment, finances, staff availability and knowledge and skills in monitoring and evaluation.

2.9 Summary of Chapter Two
This chapter has mainly looked at the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV and AIDS projects with a global, regional, and local view. It has been evident from other scholars that 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.

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 gap is what this study tried to fill in order to enlighten the project managers in Kenya, the government, donors and all other stakeholders on their relevance.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter gives brief description of the research design which was adopted in this study, the target area and population of the study, sample size and the instruments which were used for data collection as well as data analysis technique which was employed.

3.2 Research Design
A survey design which mainly describes the state of affairs of the issues under investigation or in other words is a fact finding mission was used. Survey method was used because of the nature of KAVI project, it is meant to describe a subject. This type of research also helps to collect information through description. Survey entails a systematic collection of information from a defined population, usually by means of interviews or questionnaires administered to a sample of units in the population (UN-HABITAT, 2003). The survey design is one of the most commonly used methods of descriptive research; it enables the researcher to gather data from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time (Reichardt and Cook, 1997). The method was quiet appropriate for this study because it assisted in capturing information on factors influencing effective implementation of Monitoring and evaluation in KAVI project.

3.3 Target Population
The study conducted a census of KAVI project staff. KAVI has a total of 47 staffs in its two sites that is Kenyatta Hospital and Kangemi both located in Nairobi. Out of the entire KAVI staff only 43 were eligible to the study and comprised the target population. These included the project director, project managers in various departments, the IT staff, laboratory staff, nurses, doctors and data clerks, procurement officer, accountants and office staff. The rest are the project drivers and the cleaning service team who are never involved in monitoring and evaluation practices.
3.4 Data Collection Instruments
This study used questionnaires which are forms completed and returned by respondents. An inexpensive method that is useful where literacy rates are high and respondents are co-operative. They were the main tool for collecting data in this study due to their effectiveness. The respondents were given the questionnaires on hand delivery and the same approach was used to return the questionnaires. These were all self-administered.

3.4.1 Pilot survey
Pilot testing of the research instruments was conducted using staff working on a similar HIV research project who matched my respondents. 10 questionnaires were administered to the pilot survey respondents who were chosen at random. After three days the same participants were requested to respond to the same questionnaires but without prior notification in order to ascertain any variation in responses of the first and the second test. This was very important in the research process because it assisted in identification and correction of vague questions and unclear instructions. It was also a great opportunity to capture the important comments and suggestions from the participants. This helped to improve on the efficiency of the instrument. This process was repeated until the researcher was satisfied that the instrument did not have variations or vagueness.

3.4.2 Validity of the research instruments
Validity in relation to research is a judgment regarding the degree to which the components of the research reflect the theory, concept, or variable under study (Streiner and Norman, 1996). The validity of the instrument used and validity of the research design as whole are important criteria in evaluating the worth of the results of the study conducted. A research instrument is valid if it actually measures what is supposed to measure and when the data collected through it accurately represents the respondents’ opinion. The validity of the instruments was ascertained by conducting a pilot study. This ensured that the instructions were clear and all possible responses to a question were captured. Content validity of a measuring instrument is the extent to which it provides adequate coverage of the investigative questions guiding the study (Reichardt and Cook, 1997). In the study the responses were taken to SPSS to test if they answered the
questions and if they were relevant to the study objectives. The validity was checked through this process and the minor changes which were proposed were taken into consideration.

3.4.3 Reliability of research instruments

The reliability of an instrument reflects its stability and consistency within a given context (Streiner and Norman, 1996). It is the consistency of measurement over time, whether it provides the same results on repeated trails. It is defined as a characteristic of an instrument that reflects the degree to which the instrument provokes consistent responses (Reichardt and Cook, 1997). Test-retest reliability or stability refers to degree to which research participants’ response change overtime (Reichardt and Cook, 1997). Test-retest method is used to test stability of the tool. In this method an instrument is given to the same individuals on two occasions within relatively short duration of time. A correlation coefficient is calculated to determine how closely the participants’ responses on the second occasion matched their responses on the first occasion. In this study the research tools were issued to the pilot study group in a duration of three days to check whether they would give a similar or answer that is closely related to the first one. The data was fed to the SPSS and the correlation coefficient was analyzed. The tool was found to be reliable.

3.5 Data collection procedures

The data was collected using the questionnaires which were hand delivered and then picked using the same method. The tool used (questionnaire) was divided into three sections, section A which was answered by all the respondent, section B was answered by the management and section C was answered by the staff.

3.6 Data Analysis Techniques

The data collected was coded, keyed into SPSS (a computer software database), organized, and cleaned for any errors that might have occurred during data collection. The data was then analyzed using descriptive statistics with aid of the SPSS and Microsoft Excel (computer software). Qualitative statistical techniques were used to describe and summarize data. The results were then interpreted in the form of descriptive statistics the frequencies and percentages. The findings were presented in form of tables and figures.
3.7 Operationalization of Variables

This is an explanation on how the variables are relating to each other. Each variable is given indicators and their measurements tabulated as well as the scale and tools of analysis. This is a summarized way to show how the variables will be operated in this study.
Table 3.2 Operationalization of Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To determine extent to which management commitment stimulates implementation of monitoring and evaluation | **Independent** Management commitment | - Budget allocation
- Time allocation
- Staff allocation
- Monitoring and evaluation department |
|                                                                            |                                    | - Quality of work
- Quantity of work
- Reduction in time wastage
- Implementation of findings |
|                                                                            |                                    | **Measurement Scale** | **Tools of Analysis** | **Specific Tools** |
|                                                                            |                                    | Ordinal               | Descriptive           | Frequency           |

| To establish how financial availability control the implementation of monitoring | **Independent** Financial availability | - Budget allocation
- Funding
- Financial sufficiency |
|                                                                            |                                    | - Frequency
- Timeliness
- Quality of work
- Efficiency |
|                                                                            |                                    | **Measurement Scale** | **Tools of Analysis** | **Specific Tools** |
|                                                                            |                                    | Ordinal               | Descriptive           | Frequency           |
To determine the extent to which the staff effect the implementation of monitoring and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Staff Capacity</th>
<th>-No of staff allocated</th>
<th>-Level of education</th>
<th>-Specialization</th>
<th>-Skills in monitoring and evaluation</th>
<th>-Quantity of reports</th>
<th>-Quality of reports</th>
<th>-Accuracy</th>
<th>-Timeliness</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To evaluate how skills influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Relevant Skills</th>
<th>-Level of education</th>
<th>-Monitoring and evaluation skills</th>
<th>-Professional qualifications</th>
<th>-Confidence</th>
<th>-Commitment</th>
<th>-Accuracy</th>
<th>-Independence</th>
<th>-Improved Quality</th>
<th>-Improved Quantity</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>-Descriptive</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of monitoring and evaluation</th>
<th>Dependent Implementation of monitoring and evaluation</th>
<th>-Effectiveness -Transparency -Utilization of resources</th>
<th>-Productivity -Accountability -Efficiency</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine how government policy influences implementation of monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Moderating variable</strong> -Government policies</td>
<td>-Regulations and Laws</td>
<td>-Accountability</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors which influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV Research Projects, a case of KAVI. Factors like management commitment, financial availability, staff capacity and relevant skills were investigated to find out whether they had any influence. Thirty eight (38) respondents out of a target population of forty three (43) provided the information. The data was analyzed and findings converted into mostly percentages and frequencies and then presented using tables and figures. The findings were discussed and interpreted in relation to the objectives of the study as in the following sections.

4.2 Response Return Rate of Questionnaires
The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents by hand delivery and were returned through the same media. A total of 38 respondents out of 43 filled the questionnaires representing a response rate of 88.4% of the target population; these were 5 project managers and 33 staffs. Rapport building, guaranteeing confidentiality, explaining the significance of the study to the respondents was done to maximize the response rate. The questionnaires were administered, filled anonymously, and collected immediately to ensure maximum return rate.

4.3 Demographic Information of the Respondents
Information on the gender, education qualification, professional qualification, and duration of time the respondent has worked KAVI has been analyzed.
Table 4.1 Gender of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the respondents in Table 4.1, 42.1% were males while 57.9% were females. This is clear indication that there is a gender balance in staff distribution at KAVI with female being the majority since it is a clinical based research where nurse counselors and community mobilizers who are mostly women are more involved than other staff.

Table 4.2 Education Qualification at Job Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma level</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The education level of most of the respondents in Table 4.2 ranged from a majority having achieved diploma education at job entry at 57.9% while the minority had post graduate degree at entry 5.3% and only 2.6% declined to give their academic qualification. This is a good indicator that majority had good academic qualification at job entry.
Table 4.3 Professional Qualification at Job Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers/Directors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Technologists</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Clerks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Counselors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial physician/ clinical officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 38 100

The study showed in Table 4.3 all the respondents to have had professional qualification at job entry which is a very good indicator of level of specialization and professionalism. However, vital profession in monitoring and evaluation was evidently lacking. This factor would greatly affect the implementation process.

Table 4.4 Working Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 38 100

The study revealed that the majority of the respondents in Table 4.4, 42.1% had worked at KAVI for a period of six to ten years while those who had worked for one to five years were about 39.5% and 18.4% represented those who had worked at KAVI for a period of ten years.
4.4 Objective 1: Management Commitment

Management commitment which is one of the objectives of this study was measured in terms of Staff capacity building, Budget and Staff allocation to the monitoring and evaluation department was investigated to find out whether it had any influence on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation.

Table 4.5 Availability of M&E System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the project managers were asked the question whether their organization has a monitoring and evaluation system in Table 4.5, 80% confirmed that it is there with only 20% who thought otherwise.

Table 4.6 Implementation of M&E System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.6, when the staffs were asked whether it was important to implement the monitoring and evaluation system in their organization if it did not exist only 9.1% agreed that the system existed. The rest 90.9% had contradictory information since they said it’s necessary to implement the system since it never existed.
Table 4.7 Staff Dedicated to the Monitoring and Evaluation Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.7, about 80% of the project managers who were respondents in this study confirmed that the monitoring and evaluation is the responsibility of the sponsor and only 20% said it is done by the management. This contradicts Table 4.5 where respondents said that the monitoring and evaluation system existed.

4.5 Objective 2: Financial Availability

Financial availability which is another factor in this study was looked at in terms of availability of monitoring and evaluation budget, staff capacity building and availability of monitoring and evaluation department.

Table 4.8 Availability of M&E Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.8, 80% of the respondents who were the project managers agreed that there is a budget for monitoring and evaluation in the organization. The 20% who did not agree with there being budget for monitoring and evaluation, argued that the budget that exist is controlled by the donors and thus they are not flexible enough to use it to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation system.
Table 4.9 Budget Allocated to Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The management when asked to give their take on the budget allocated to the monitoring and evaluation in Table 4.9, 60% acknowledged that it was inadequate with only 40% terming it to be adequate. This is a confirmation that finances are required to have a strong monitoring and evaluation system.

4.6 Objective 3: Staff Capacity

The third objective which is the influence of the staff capacity on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation was measured using three indicators namely the staffs’ level of education, skills in monitoring and evaluation and the number of staff dedicated to the monitoring and evaluation department.

Table 4.10 Staffing Capacity in Terms of Numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Capacity (Number of Staffs)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully staffed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under staffed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>97.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.10, a total of 75.7% respondents agreed that the organization is fully staffed while only 24.3% refuted and described the organization to be understaffed; however 2.6% of the respondents did not give their view. When the 75.7% of these respondents were asked to explain
they indicated that the staffs that are there are only equipped to run their respective duties as designated. However there was mutual agreement that there are no staffs designated to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities and that they were all equipped for the day to day activities of the project as per their professional qualification.

Table 4.11 Influence of Staff Capacity on Implementation of M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the respondents who were asked to give their opinion whether staff capacity has any influence on the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system in Table 4.11, 92.1% agreed that staff capacity has great influence while 7.9% disagreed with that statement.

Table 4.12 Staff Involvement in Implementation of M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staffs were asked their view on whether there is need for them to be involved in the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. Out of all the respondents in Table 4.12, 97% strongly agreed that staff involvement in monitoring and evaluation was vital to its successive implementation. However 3% only agreed while none of the respondents disagreed with this statement.
Table 4.13 Staffs Level of Participation in M&E Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passively</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the respondents in Table 4.13 who gave their view on their level of participation in the monitoring and evaluation 72.7% agreed that they passively participated and explained the nature of participation as only when responding to the monitors queries which are sent to them after the end of the monitoring and evaluation process. However 27.3% who said are actively involved majority of them also said the nature of involvement is only in responding to the external monitor’s queries.

4.7 Objective 4: Relevant Skills

The influence of relevant skills on implementation of monitoring and evaluation was measured using the level of staff participation, professional qualification, and skills in monitoring and evaluation.

Table 4.14 Relevant Skills and Implementation of M&E System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the respondents in Table 4.14 were asked whether in their opinion they agreed that relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation are important to its implementation, 97% strongly agreed with only 3% who just agreed. This shows that the staffs are aware that they need to be equipped with relevant skills for them to perform better.
Table 4.15  Staffs Attendance in M&E Meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study in Table 4.15 shows that 69.7% of the respondents are involved in the monitoring and evaluation meetings. However, when a further question was asked to explain the nature of the meetings all of them agreed that they only meet for the monitors debriefing sessions before and after the monitoring period. This shows that these staff are oblivious of the happenings they only have a snapshot of the entire process. But 30.3% reported that they have never attended any monitoring and evaluation meetings. This they argued that the meetings are only meant for managers and the technical staffs.

Table 4.16  Staffs Level of M&E Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study in Table 4.16 found that only 21.2% of the respondents have good monitoring and evaluation skills which they acknowledged that is only as a result of interacting closely with the external monitors but not through any formal training. The 51.5% said that they have average skills which again have resulted from the duration of time they have worked at KAVI and their interaction with the external monitors during resolving of the queries. However 27.3% have skills which are below average, they only see monitors come do the monitoring send the queries which they give detailed information/recommendation on how they should be resolved. This
shows that the staffs only participate superficially in the entire process which in actual sense they should own.

**Table 4.17 Project Managers Level of Skills in M&E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total    | 5         | 100         |

This study in Table 4.17 revealed that 40% of the respondents who are the project managers have average skills which they attributed to the years of experience but not as a result of any training or seminar attended in monitoring and evaluation. The 60% who have good skills only a few could attribute it to the training attended on monitoring and evaluation.

**Table 4.18 Impact of level of training on M&E on its implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total    | 5         | 100         |

When the project managers who participated in the study were asked whether in their opinion the level of relevant training in monitoring and evaluation had impact on its implementation, they all (100%) agreed that it had impact.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter gives summary of the research findings as analyzed in the previous chapter. It all shows the conclusions as per the research questions and also the researcher’s recommendations. It will also indicate the areas for further research.

5.2 Summary of Findings
This research was based on the topic: factors influencing the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV Research projects, a case of KAVI. The findings are summarized in respect to each research objective.

5.2.1 Management commitment and the implementation of M&E at KAVI
In terms of management commitment to staff capacity building there is indication that nothing has been done to enhance skills in the staff. The duration one works in an organization should be proportional to the level of capacity building one has received if there is commitment on the management. Majority of the respondents seems to have worked in the organization for a period of 6-10 years. This should therefore easily reflect the staff capacity building in terms of relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation if the system is in existent. Relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation are known to greatly influence its implementation and therefore all the staff involved should be equipped with these vital skills for effectiveness and productivity.

However despite the fact that the staff have been participating in monitoring and evaluation there is no initiative seen to train the staff on this practice. From the study it is clear that staff capacity has influence on implementation of the monitoring and evaluation. But there seems to be no action being taken by the management to build their capacity. This to some extent may be attributed to the lack of interest from the management to have a monitoring and evaluation system since they are the ones responsible to liaise with the donors regarding this necessity.
Budget allocation is the responsibility of the management and it takes commitment and interest to allocate finances in areas of priority. According to this study the budget allocated to monitoring and evaluation is not adequate, this could be argued that monitoring and evaluation is not a priority and thus does not need to be given emphasis as far as its budgeting is concerned. Up to 80% of the respondents acknowledged that there was a budget set for monitoring and evaluation. The study indicates that management has great influence on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. It was evident that there was no monitoring and evaluation department in place contrary to what the management had indicated. This is because they acknowledged that the process was conducted by the sponsors and there were no staff dedicated to it. There was laxity on the part of management to set the monitoring and evaluation system since they seemed comfortable with the existing system which is controlled by the sponsor.

5.2.2 Financial Availability and the Implementation of M&E at KAVI.

Though the 80% of the respondents agreed that there is budget for monitoring and evaluation, they also confirmed that it is controlled by the sponsors. This makes their hands tied to spend even a cent of it in improving the monitoring and evaluation process. There is no budget to cater for the staff capacity both in terms of numbers and skills. For any effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation a budget should be set aside to take care of the immerse needs of the system starting from staffing to enhancing capacity as well as sustaining it. Though the project managers agreed that there was a budget they acknowledged that this budget is not adequate. This shows that even if they wanted to control the monitoring and evaluation system they were not in a position due to the limited resources. An effective monitoring and evaluation system requires finances for staffing, capacity building, as well as running the process. This determines the number of times the monitoring and evaluation is conducted. This study confirms that that lack of finances has contributed to their lack of an effective monitoring and evaluation system. The study confirms that a monitoring and evaluation department is lacking. To set up and sustain a monitoring and evaluation department requires enough resources both human and financial and the overall control is the financial availability.
5.2.2 Staff Capacity and the Implementation of M&E at KAVI

There is a good indicator that all of the respondents have attained college education with majority having attained diplomas in their respective field at job entry. Because there were no direct measures for “skills”, indicators of educational attainment have typically been used as a proxy measure, with educational attainment being measured as the highest level of education completed, ranging from certificate to postgraduate degree. However, these indicators cannot distinguish between the acquisition of specific knowledge required in implementation of monitoring and evaluation versus literacy skills. It is therefore expected that the implementation of monitoring and evaluation can be enhanced by increasing capacity building of the staff. This study confirms that there is no respondent who confirmed to have been trained in monitoring and evaluation at job entry. The monitoring and evaluation skills were lacking in all the respondents and those who confessed to have average skills acknowledged that they were as a result of the years of experience and interaction with the monitors. This confirmed that no staffs were designated to the monitoring and evaluation department which was also non-existent.

It is clearly evident that for a monitoring and evaluation system to be effectively implemented there is need for staff capacity in terms of numbers as well as skills. The level of professionalism among the respondents is upheld where there are staffs allocated to various departments with respect to their professional qualification. But one vital profession, the monitoring and evaluation was missing from that cadre. There should be staff dedicated to handle the operations of the system. Lack of the monitoring and evaluation department summarizes the whole problem of inefficiency of monitoring and evaluation. The staffs also lack skills in monitoring and evaluation to be able to conduct it. 75.7% agreed that the organization was fully staffed but they made it clear that the staffing capacity is only meant to handle the protocol related duties. They acknowledged that there are no adequate staffs to handle their day to day activities and still be involved in monitoring and evaluation activities.
5.2.3 Relevant Skills and the Implementation of M &E at KAVI

The respondents in the study confirmed that relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation were important for its effective implementation. As earlier discussed the respondents had attained good education at job entry as well as relevant professional qualification. However though they were participating in the monitoring their participation was only very insignificant. This was evident when they described their level of participation as passive. The study reveals that the respondents are only involved in responding to the queries developed by the external monitors. They further explained that they are even guided in the manner to respond to these queries. This shows their incapacitation level as far as monitoring and evaluation is concerned.

The study confirmed that the relevant skills in monitoring were lacking when the majority of the respondents both staffs and project managers confessed to have average skills. They further explained that they have not received a formal training in monitoring and evaluation but only achieved skills in responding to the monitors queries which can be attributed to the years of experience at work. The respondents did not have any relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation with majority only having average skills which they said had resulted from the years of experience working with external monitors. Therefore, how can they implement what they cannot handle? It is very necessary to equip them with the necessary skills in order to implement the system.

This lack of skills is also evident in the response as to whether the respondents had attended any meeting in monitoring and evaluation. The study revealed that though 69.7% of them attended monitoring and evaluation meetings they clarified those meetings to be the monitors debriefing sessions before and after the monitoring visit to discuss what to expect and to give them findings at the end of that visit. This shows staff who want in terms of relevant skills as long as they are to be involved wholly in the monitoring and evaluation process. There can never be a successive implementation of monitoring and evaluation system without having staff who have the relevant skills.
5.3 Discussions of the Findings
The objectives of the study will be discussed to find out whether they were met by the findings of the study. The study will look at the ways that management commitment, financial availability, staff capacity and relevant skills influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation.

5.3.1 Management Commitment and Implementation of M&E
This objective is supposed to establish if the management commitment in terms of dedicating staff to the monitoring and evaluation, staff capacity building and availability of monitoring and evaluation department influences the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. The study shows lack of management commitment towards implementation of monitoring and evaluation. Despite the fact that the organization is fully staffed there seems to be no staff dedicated to the monitoring and evaluation department neither is the department existing. The exercise is conducted by the sponsor who controls when and what to monitor. Management as well as all the other staff only plays a passive role. This is a confirmation of what IFAD (2002) report said that most organizations do not have the management capacity and enabling environment for implementing monitoring and evaluation. It further says that lack of monitoring and evaluation system as well as staff dedicated to it is a hindrance to the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system.

The management is the key determinants of the success or failure of a project, (Nokes, 2007). A weakness of the monitoring and evaluation system means lack of data to guide programming, coordination and implementation of program or project interventions (Ediau, 2012). Ediau (2012) further noted that the management staff were the pillar of success of these projects and were the backbone of a strong monitoring and evaluation system. The management, who are the key decision makers (Margoluis R., 1998), should be the key initiators for a monitoring and evaluation system (DAC, 2005), which is a key tool in management practice (Nokes, 2007). This however is lacking because most of the project managers are not well equipped in monitoring and evaluation skills. Most of the third world projects are known to fail due to management team who are not success oriented (World Bank, 2000). There should be clear indication that the management is actively pushing for the implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system.
which is lacking according to this study. IFAD (2002) in its report said for success and sustainability of any project there should be a strong monitoring and evaluation system. It is the responsibility of every program/project manager to ensure that there is a very active and efficient monitoring and evaluation department to ensure success (Lahey, 2005).

5.3.2 Financial Availability and Implementation of M&E

Most of the donor funded projects are faced with premature termination incase the donors withdraw because they lack a system to guide them and direct them on their progress to ensure sustainability (Lahey, 2005). The project directors and coordinators need to factor their own budget for implementing a monitoring and evaluation system when applying for funding (Worldbank, 2004). There is a confirmation from the study that finances are required to have a strong monitoring and evaluation system. It shows that the sponsor controls the monitoring and evaluation budget. This has led to the organization not having a monitoring and evaluation department and the exercise is controlled by the sponsor where the staffs for monitoring are sent and paid by the sponsor and the organization has no control.

Lack of adequate financial resources was noted to affect the performance as well as quality of monitoring and evaluation (Langi, 2008). Langi, further found out that project appraisal documents made limited provision for systematic baseline and subsequent beneficial surveys. The budget implications for baseline surveys, setting up management of monitoring and evaluation were systematically underestimated. It was recognized that failure to ensure spending of a reasonable proportion of resources on this important aspect of the program/project management is likely to reduce internal learning and result in poor performance (Pasteur and Turall, 2006).

5.3.3 Staff Capacity and Implementation of M&E

The level of education of staff indicates that most of them have attained college education with majority having attained a diploma (57.9%) at job entry. This is very impressive since it indicates there is potential for capacity building. However, none of these staff have attained any training in monitoring and evaluation to equip them for the process. Hardly will the level of education translate to skills proficiency (Conar, 1996). Therefore, there is dire need to equip the
staff with the skills required. Staff capacity, as much as finance is vital to successful implementation of monitoring and evaluation system (Lehman, Friedman, & Sanders, 2004). Thus the organizations and donors should go beyond those qualifications and equip the project staff with the monitoring and evaluation skills. Staff capacity in terms of numbers and skills is of paramount importance as far as the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system is concerned (Görgens, Nkwazi, & Govindaraj, 2005). This is evident in most HIV Research projects which are donor funded where they lack their own monitoring system leading to their failure (NACC, 2005). This is what triggered the need to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation systems in HIV projects in Kenya (NACC, 2005).

For monitoring and evaluation to be effective there is need for it to be participatory where all the stakeholders are involved (Kusters, Vught, Wigboldus, & Woodhill, 2011). This can only take place where all the stakeholders are equipped with the necessary and relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation. The staffs who participate in the project undertakings are responsible for the success of the project. They should be involved actively in the monitoring and evaluation activities as part and parcel of the system (Ediau, 2012). This involvement of the staff and all other stakeholders ensures strengthening of the monitoring and evaluation system and enhances the level of accountability and transparency (Conar, 1996).

5.3.4 Relevant Skills and the Implementation of M&E

The study shows that the staffs are aware that they need to be equipped with relevant skills for them to perform better. The skills in monitoring and evaluation are known to match the outcome and impact of the project (Chaplowe, 2008). Any organization dedicated to seeing the success of its interventions must invest heavily on equipping the staff with the monitoring and evaluation skills (World Bank, 2002). The respondents confirmed that relevant skills greatly influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system. This actually confirmed what the IFAD (2002), in its report said that in order to implement an effective monitoring and evaluation system it is vital to equip the staff with the relevant skills on the same. The monitoring and evaluation capacity requirements of the project should be considered in the context of the capacity needs of sectoral and national institutions in the country (World Bank Independent Evaluation GROUP, 2006). A monitoring and evaluation design should build on these
arrangements but develop further technical skills required to plan for information needs, design data collection, execute studies and surveys, analyze data and report in a format relevant to users (Dyason, 2010).

5.4 Conclusions
There is need for management to have commitment towards the success of the project. This will be reflected in terms of staff capacity building efforts, both in staffing and training (Bailey and Deen, 2002). The management should give monitoring and evaluation priority (Margoluis R., 1998), since it is a vital planning tool in project management (Nokes, 2007).

Financial availability is another factor that affects the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. Most of the respondents in the study said that the budget allocated by the donors is not adequate. This ties their hands from effectively implementing the monitoring and evaluation system. Monitoring and evaluation is not working because of poor or insufficient capacity. IFAD (2002) also recognizes that financial availability possess greatest obstacle towards successive implementation of the monitoring and evaluation.

Technical capacity and infrastructure to supply monitoring and evaluation information is another driver according to (Lahey, 2005). Without the skills to perform baseline study, use monitoring and evaluation tools effectively, the process will be affected negatively. Most of those who do not possess the skills also said lack financial support to attend monitoring and evaluation trainings and seminars is the main cause of their limited skills. (Forss and Carlsson, 1997), says that the growing need for efficiency, cost effective and results mean it is essential that staff have skills which enable them to perform to their best. There is need for staff capacity in terms of numbers as well as skills (Foundation, 1998), which will enable them to be productive and effective. Relevant skills have a direct effect on monitoring and evaluation in many ways. Looking at the statistics most of the staff and management do not have enough monitoring and evaluation skills and none seems to have attended any training/ this limitation translates to misinterpretation of monitoring and evaluation frameworks.
5.5 Recommendations

1. This research suggests that organization should be able to raise enough funds from the project sponsors or donors in order to have staff capacity in terms of numbers and skills in M&E. This can be done during proposal writing to include a budget for M&E; and administration costs for officers involved in the projects.

2. The study also suggested the organization to set up a M&E department to manage all monitoring and evaluation activities within the organization. This is effective because would cut down the costs of hiring officers to monitor every project. It ensures accountability and sustainability of project should donors withdraw.

3. The study suggested that the organization to strengthen the existing M&E system for efficiency and productivity.

5.6 Suggestions for further Research
This study proposes further research to be done by other scholars on the following:

1) The study recommends that research to be done to address the gap that exists between interpretation of M&E frameworks and its implementation as regards to the log frame. There should be found a way the donor organization’s m and e framework localized into the implementation organization.

2) The study also recommends research be done to investigate the optimal staffing levels and capacity needs for effective implementation of M&E.
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APPENDIX I

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Respondents,

My name is Agatha N. Magondu of the University of Nairobi; I am carrying out research on the factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV research projects in Kenya: A case of KAVI; for partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management.

Monitoring is the practice of ensuring that the activities are done within the given standards to achieve the expected results and is done regularly throughout the project. Evaluation is ensuring that the project interventions produce the expected impact at the end of a certain period, it’s thus done periodically. This study aims at finding out if the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation is controlled by management, finances, staff, and skills.

The tool used (questionnaire) is divided into three sections, section A is for all the respondent, section B will be answered by the management and section C will be answered by other staff. In case of any clarification the respondent is free to contact the research assistant responsible.

The information you are going to give is for academic purposes only and your identity and information will not be shared with anyone else, hence will be treated as confidential.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Yours Faithfully,

Sign________________________________________________

Agatha N. Magondu,

L50/73185/2012

University of Nairobi.

Respondents Name(Optional)________________________________

Respondents’ No. __________________________________________

Sign ______________________________________________________

Date ______________________________________________________
APPENDIX II
SECTION A: Personal Profile

Instructions for use

This questionnaire is divided into three sections.

You are requested to be as honest as possible when answering the questions.

No external influence is allowed when answering the questions.

You are required to tick the answer in the box provided or give your explanation in space provided.

1. Respondents’ No.______________________________

2. Gender: Male ( )                     Female ( )

3. What was your academic qualification on job entry
   a) Postgraduate level
   b) Degree level
   c) Diploma level
   d) Certificate level
   e) Other
      Specify______________________________________________________________

4. Professional qualification at entry if any i.e. Project manager, IT staff, data clerk etc
   ___________________________________________________________________

5. How long have you worked for KAVI project
   a) 1-5 years
   b) 6-10 years
   c) More than 10 years
SECTION B: MANAGEMENT

(Management Commitment and Financial Availability)

1. Does your organization have a monitoring and evaluation system?
   a) Yes
   b) No

2. If yes in question (1) above, is there a budget dedicated for this?
   a) Yes
   b) No

3. In your opinion how would you rate the budget allocation for monitoring and evaluation in your organization
   a) Adequate
   b) Inadequate
   c) Excess

4. Does the budget allocation influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in your organization?
   a) Yes
   b) No

   If Yes, briefly explain how _______________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

5. Who does monitoring and evaluation (compliance audit) in your organization?
   a) Dedicated staff
   b) Management
   c) Contracted company
   d) Sponsor

6. What is your level of training in monitoring and evaluation?
   a) Advanced
   b) Good
   c) Average
   d) Below average
7. In your opinion does your level of training in monitoring and evaluation impact its implementation?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   Briefly explain______________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

8. How do the findings of monitoring benefit your organization? __________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

9. How do finances allocated for monitoring and evaluation affect its implementation in your organization?
   a) Greatly
   b) Moderately
   c) Minimally
   d) No influence

10. How would you rate budget allocation in your department?
    a) Adequate
    b) Partially Adequate
    c) Inadequate

11. In your opinion would sufficient funds allocation affect the monitoring and evaluation in your organization positively?
    a) Yes
    b) No

    Briefly explain______________________________________________________________
    _________________________________________________________________
    _________________________________________________________________
SECTION C: STAFF
(Staff Capacity and Relevant Skills)

1. What rate can you give the staffing capacity of your project
   a) Fully staffed
   b) Understaffed
   c) Overstaffed

2. Do you think the staff capacity in your project has any influence on effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation system?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   Briefly explain____________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________

3. Involvement of staff in implementation of monitoring and evaluation is very vital to the success of the project
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree

4. Have you attended any meeting on monitoring and evaluation in your project?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   Please briefly explain your answer_________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________

5. Would you recommend your projects to implement a monitoring and evaluation system (If not in place)?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   Briefly explain your answer___________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________

  Respondents’ Number……………..
6. How do you participate in your project monitoring and evaluation
   a) Actively
   b) Passively
   Briefly explain__________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

7. What level of monitoring and evaluation skills do you possess?
   a) Advanced
   b) Good
   c) Average
   d) Below Average

8. Relevant skills in monitoring and evaluation are important for its effective implementation
   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   Briefly explain__________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION