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ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to determine the influence of the monitoring and evaluation tools in the completion of the projects. The study was centered on main tools of monitoring and evaluation which were: Strategic plan, Logical Framework, Budget and stakeholders analysis. This was guided by four objectives: to establish extent to which the use of strategic plan influences the level of project completion, to assess extent to which logical framework influences the level of project completions, to assess extent to which Budget adherence influences the level of project completion and to assess extent to which stakeholder analysis influences the level of project completion. The study was carried out in Kakamega County which has 12 constituencies. Four constituencies were randomly sampled, from where five CDF funded projects were purposively identified from each of the constituency. Large projects whose costs exceed one million shillings each were considered for sampling. Five committee members from each of the CDF projects (including chairmen and heads of institutions) were purposively sampled. Other respondents were purposively sampled from Ministries of works and health, community leaders and other stakeholders. Data was collected by questionnaires; document analysis, checklists and scheduled interviews. A total of 120 respondents were targeted out of which 106 respondents availed the data. Data was analysed both descriptively and inferentially, using SPSS and Microsoft office suite. The findings showed that Monitoring & Evaluation tools have influence on project completion. Precisely 88.9% noted that strategic plan has high influence over project completion, 80.7% observed logical framework has high influence over project completion and 80.8% noted budget has high influence over project completion. Regarding stakeholder’s analysis, 90.4% said it has a significant influence on project completion. The results showed significant correlation between monitoring and evaluation tools and project completion. The study concluded that there is need to incorporate these tools in project management. The study recommended that all the concern should be empowered with skills and knowledge in order to have grasp of how monitoring and evaluation tools can be utilized. Parliamentary finance committee and CDF management should ensure ongoing projects are completed before initiating new projects, political leadership notwithstanding that normally interferes with funding.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

This chapter covers various aspects that include the background of the study, the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study. It further considers research objectives and questions, hypotheses, significance of the study, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, definition of significant terms, and organization of the study. According to Simon (1986), Project monitoring is the continuous assessment of Project implementation in relation to design schedules, and of the use of inputs, infrastructure, and services by project beneficiaries. Simon further observes that project evaluation is the periodic assessment of a project's relevance, performance, efficiency, and impact both expected and unexpected in relation to stated objectives.

WBG, (1998), advices that there is need for effective Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) which is increasingly being recognized as an indispensable tool of both project and portfolio management. This is because M&E provide a basis for accountability in the use of development resources. Further M&E can be applied to strengthen the project design and implementation and stimulate partnership with project stakeholders.

Due to the foregoing, different countries have adopted aspects of this approach. For example, Ghana came up with a commission the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) as a regulatory policy to assimilate the principle of M&E operations. NDPC adapted the Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBMES) and Results Based Budgeting (RBB) in the M&E process. This was purposely to ensure cost effectiveness, institutional
capacity strengthening, promotion of good governance and accountability as well as credibility to the partners and government.

Since acquisition of independence of Kenya in 1963, there have been several attempts to tailor a system of socio economic development best suited for the rural poor population. Towards this, the government came up with concept of pooling resources together in the spirit of Harambee’ consequently many institutions especially schools and other facilities in the health sector were put up successfully in the spirit of Harambee (Moi, 1986).

During the 1980s this concept of Harambee spirit of development was further enhanced by empowering committees at grass root level. The government on its part purposed to bring management of projects closer to the people through district focus for rural development, have budgeting process using the district as the focal point for allocation of financial resources.

This entailed focusing development at constituency level which had immense development impact (GOK, 2003). Many projects at constituency level have come up as a result of this. These includes schools, health facilities; roads and water amongst others, since the management of financial resources from the government towards the projects has been partly in question, the government has been reviewing laws and procedures of governing CDF funding for instance the CDF (Act 2013 sec. 30) was a review of CDF (Act 2003) so as to enhance project development.

In furtherance of the same objective, the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) was established in 2004 by the Kenyan government. NIMEs was launched during the London investment summit 2012. The system is used to trace development at both National and County government level in the current devolved system of governance GOK, (2013).
In furtherance of the same objective, Kariuki (2013) recommended that CDF project be harmonized with the local priorities. Kariuki further observes that establishment of community based institutional mechanism to enhance community participation in various projects should be mandatory.

In spite of the foregoing, the influence of M&E tools on completion of the projects is not accorded significance in CDF projects. In the current system where there is no harmonized M&E in many projects, there is a possibility that this may impact negatively on the level of completion of such projects. This creates formidable challenge in both institutions and in the community at large hence the gap that requires to be investigated.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The CDF was established through an act of parliament, CDF ACT, (2003) and reviewed in 2013, CDF ACT, (2013). The aim was to devolve national resources to community level with aim to spring economic development at the grassroots level. That would result into overall National socio economic growth. This was to empower local communities with ability to participate in socio economic activities that are related to their growth. Wabwire (2010), observed that the implementation of the devolved government system to County levels as stipulated in the new constitution has strengthened the strategic role of CDF in the devolved County governments as it has brought it closer to the benefiting community. In spite of the foregoing, there have been a lot of challenges in the implementation of the devolved structures which have negated the benefits of CDF operations. The challenges include inappropriate implementation of the projects resulting in some projects not being completed as planned and management capabilities of some committee members being questionable.

In study commissioned by Institute of Economic Affairs (I.E.A) in 25 constituencies to determine public participation in CDF development processes, it was revealed that only 38.7% participated in the election and prioritization of project (IEA, 2006). In this study, low
citizenship participation in the M & E of projects funded through CDF was observed. This was attributable to the approach adapted by M&E committees. Here CDF officials took trips around county to view the projects being implemented and referred to such visits as M & E of projects. In most cases the element of M&E tools was not and has not been evidently emphasized hence the need to establish a process that will enhance the impact of Monitoring and Evaluation on CDF projects in Kakamega County. The study therefore endeavors to delve into the influence of M&E tools for effective planning, implementation, and completion of CDF projects.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The study sort to establish the extent to which M&E tools influence completion of the CDF funded projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.

1.4 Research objectives

i. To establish the extent to which the use of Strategic Plan influences the level of Project completion.

ii. To assess the extent to which Logical Framework influences the level of project completion.

iii. To evaluate extent to which Budget influences the level Project completion.

iv. To assess the extent to which Stakeholders analysis influences the level of project completion.

1.5 Research questions

i. To what extent does the use of Strategic plan influence level of project completion?

ii. To what extent does the use of Logical Framework influence the level of Project completion?
iii. To what extent does budgeting influence the level of Project completion?

iv. To what extent does Stakeholder’s analysis influence the level of Project completion?

1.6 Research hypotheses

In order to answer the research questions, the study tested for the following hypotheses

1. Null hypothesis - Ho: The application of strategic plan does not influence the level of Project completion.
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: application of strategic plan influences the level of project completion.

2. Null hypothesis - Ho: application of logical frame work does not influence the level of project completion.
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: application of logical frame work influences the level of project completion.

3. Null hypothesis - Ho: adherence on the budget has no influence of project level completion
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: adherence to the budget has influence on project level completion.

3. Null hypothesis - Ho: Stakeholders analysis has no influence on project level completion
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: stakeholder analysis has influence on project level completion.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The output of the study will assist formulation of a systematic process of applying M and E tools on CDF projects completion. The expected outcome will be completion and
maintenance of viable projects that will have significant impact on the development of communities and viability of institutions. This will further result into better understanding of influence of M&E tools and their impact on completion of CDF projects, will result into assistance of formulation of policy in the key area of project planning, implementation and completion. Finally it will also contribute to scientific knowledge base for academic purpose as well as project planning, implementation and sustainability of regional, national and international levels.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The study is designed to investigate the influence of M&E tools on CDF projects completion in Kakamega County in the Republic of Kenya. The study utilized CDF projects budget estimates in institutions like schools, health, water community projects, transport networks like roads and public offices like AP Camps. Four M&E tools were considered thus, Strategic Plan, Logical Frame work, Budget, and Stakeholder analysis.

1.9 Limitations of the study

There is no standard M&E tools formulated for project implementation and Completion across the country consequently; the researcher was at liberty to adopt whatever is suitable. Kakamega county is an expansive county and populous hence coverage of all the constituencies in the county is difficult. In addition the empirical documented data on CDF projects is still scanty especially on M&E of the projects as few studies have been carried out in the area.

1.10 Assumptions of the study

A number of assumptions were made in the research proposal these included; M&E tools that would influence the completion projects; CDF projects implementers utilize M&E tools; the respondents filled the questionnaires with honesty and integrity which enabled collection of the data.
1.11 Definitions of significant terms

A stakeholder analysis: is the means for identifying who the organizations internal and external stakeholders are, what their expectations are from the organization, how they influence and evaluate the organization, what the organization needs from them, and how important they are to the success of the organization. (Bryson 1995).

Budget: Amount of money you need for a particular purposes (oxford advance learners Dictionary 8th edition)

Budgeting: An estimate of costs revenues and resources over a specified period, reflecting a reading of future financial conditions and goals.

CDF: Constituency development fund, funding arrangement that channel money from central government directly to electoral constituency for local infrastructure projects (Kenya budget 2010).

Completion: The act or process of finishing something or the state of being finished or complete for example a project (Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary, 2010).

Evaluation: Involves assessing the strength and weakness of projects, policies and personnel Products and organizations to improve their effectiveness. (By American evaluation association)

Full contract: A project assigned to a contractor by CDF office to put up a project and hand over the complete work.

Harambee: Raising funds together for development project (Oxford advanced learners dictionary, 2010).

Level of project completion: Refers to stages of completion of a project with reference to the project plan.

Logical framework (log frame): Is an analytical and management tool which is now used
by most multi-lateral and bi-lateral aid agencies NGO’s and by many partners and governments, for management of development projects. (Pradhan 2011)

**Monitoring:** Intermittent regular or irregular series of observations in time, carried out to show the extent of compliance with a formulated standard or degree of deviation from expected norm (Hellawel, 1991).

**Strategic plan:** Is a document used to communicate with the organization goals, the actions needed to achieve those goals and the other critical elements developed during the Planning exercise (Balanced score card institute).

**Strategic planning:** It is collective undertaking among stakeholders in a group or an organization that seeks to establish as the precisely as possible, the desired goals.

**Stakeholder:** Any person or company involved in a particular project or system especially if they have invested money in it for example, stakeholder economy invested by Government or any organization.

**Tool:** Implement especially one held in the land, used to carry out a particular function. (Oxford advance learners dictionary, 2010)

**1.12 Organization of the study**

Quantitative and Qualitative methods of data collection were used. Similarly quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were used, the literature reviews, primary and secondary data analysis, were used. Data was analysed by use of SPSS and Microsoft office suit and specific tests done comprised; correlations and relations between independent and dependent variables.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Information presented in this chapter provides both theoretical and intellectual background to the study and will lead to a conceptual framework on which this research is based. This section also covers, project completion, M&E, systematically considers M&E tools relevant in the study which includes; Strategic plan, Logical framework, Budget and Stakeholders involvement in project planning, implementation, and completion.

2.1.1 Concepts of M&E

Project monitoring is the continuous assessment of project implementation in relation to design schedules, and the use of inputs, infrastructure, and services by project beneficiaries Simon (1986). Project evaluation is the periodic assessment of a project's relevance, performance, efficiency, and impact both expected and unexpected in relation to stated objectives Simon (1986). Projects monitoring and evaluation provide managers and stakeholders with continuous feedback on implementation, interim and terminal evaluations. These are conducted on projects as ways to identify necessary adjustments in project design and to assess the projects’ effects and their potential completion Paul (2005).

Project sustainability is currently an extremely relevant concept worldwide. It refers to the continuation of a Project’s goals, principles, and efforts to achieve desired outcomes (Paul 2005; Simon, (1986). The efficient and informed utilization of project M&E tools greatly affects project outcomes and therefore it is important to analyse their utilization in various projects. This in turn informs both project managers and stakeholders on areas of improvement for the achievement of better outcomes and completion.
2.1.2 Monitoring and Evaluation tools relevant in project completion

According to WBG (1998), there is need for effective M&E of projects as this is increasingly recognized as an indispensable tool of both project and portfolio management. This acknowledged need to improve the performance of development assistance calls for close attention to the provision of management information, both to support the implementation of projects and programs and to feed back into the design of new initiatives. The WBG further avers that M&E also provides a basis for accountability in the use of development resources. Given the greater transparency now expected of the development of community, governments and agencies assisting them need to respond to calls for more "success on the ground". Here, there should be examples of development projects with evidence that they have systems in place that support learning from experience. At all stages of the project cycle, M&E tools can help to strengthen project design and implementation and stimulate partnership with project stakeholders. This is because it can influence sector assistance strategy. Relevant analysis from project and policy evaluation can highlight the outcomes of previous interventions, and the strengths and weaknesses of their implementation. It can also improve project design and use of project design tools such as the logical framework results in systematic selection of indicators for monitoring project performance.

2.2.1. Strategic planning and project completion

According to Bryson (1995), strategic planning is an organization management activity that is used to set priorities, focus energy and resources strengthen operations. Strategic planning involves identification of most important options towards the realization of a practical vision (goal). A strategy is seen as the approach to be used step by step by an organization to most effectively accomplish its mission towards a practical vision. It is a set a procedures and tools designed to help leader’s managers and planners think and act strategically.
Barry (1997) sees strategic planning as a process not done off activity but ongoing or continuous process. It helps stakeholders in an organization or a project determine what they intend to accomplish in a specified period of time. This ensures that employees and other stakeholders; are working towards common goals have established agreement around intended outcomes or results, assess and adjust the organizations direction in response to actions that shape and guide what an organization serves, what it does and why it does it, while a focusing on the future BSSI, (2014). The strategic planning thus ensures project completion and sustainability.

For example, UNOPS drives focus through its engagement acceptance process which is also a central component of the organization risk management system. The process assures that UNOPS only accepts projects that emphasize UNOPS strategic plan and relevant UN branches. Specifically this assessment checks that new projects offer effective contributions to National capacity development and incorporate the three dimensions of sustainability, these are; sustainable project management, sustainable infrastructure and sustainable procurement. A case in point is where they ensure that all projects are screened and approved using minimum sustainability standards with higher sustainability targets negotiated wherever possible. It should be noted that project sustainability is not given the weight it deserves as an important aspect for projects management (Paul, 2005).

In another study on sustainability in India M & E rated the sustainability of the projects as moderately low primarily due to uncertainty regarding factors such failure to get continuous funding. It is important to note that the details of the strategy must be based on the whole spectrum of environmental, social and political conditions. It was noted that completion strategy created during the design phase with its complement of completion indicators are more than the norm in development projects around the world (IFAD, 2006).
According to Schilder (1997), successful efforts, involve stakeholders support. Strategic plan development requires consideration and articulation of values and priorities; the plan should reflect views expressed by all those involved in the process. States that have successfully designed and adopted plans included all those interested in the strategic planning process. For example, processes have been developed to involve program managers, providers, legislators, and the public in the articulation of visions. Some states have held public meetings; others have coupled meetings of policy makers with public opinion polls asking about the core values of citizens. Inclusion of key stakeholders can take many months and requires that resources be devoted to the activity. However, it is essential to the success and sustainability of the effort.

According to Mulwa (2010), strategic planning concerns itself with vision, mission, goals and values of the organization, which the organization will serve, organization role in the community further concerned with resources needed – people, money expertise, relationships and facilities. Bryson et al (1995) observed that strategic planning is a technical approach that is, the planning team should be hybrid so that there is some assurance that both political and technical concerns are addressed. It fuses planning and decision making.

CDF in Kenya faces various challenges. Especially related to strategic planning for instance there is evidence that there are no satisfactory resources availed to complete the necessary internal and external oversight and audits that are in CDF legislation (GOK, 2009). Second there is no guarantee that ordinary constituencies will be fully knowledgeable and able to act effectively in developing plans for CDF projects. Third the CDF program is subject to cumbersome process of coordination with other government agencies opening a loop hole for fraud and corruption. This is especially significant against broader efforts to decentralization. Further it will be necessary to develop procedures for effective cost planning in support of
project implementation as it is necessary to address the politicized nature of the CDF funds, in order to ensure project completion regardless of electoral results. In the prevailing scenarios CDF funds are dispersed to various projects without due reference to neither Strategic plans nor the time frame of the project. Nyandemo (2010) the repairs maintenance, rehabilitations are given equal chances like a planned and approved project depending on the political environment and availability of funds therefore. There is need to consider the influence of a Strategic plan to further funding this is not given attention it deserves before discernment of the funds, therefore significantly affects the completion of the project.

2.2.2. Logical framework and project completion.

Logical framework approach (LFA) is a systematic planning procedure for complete project cycle management. It is a problem solving approach that takes in views of all stakeholders. It is a criteria for project success and lists the major assumptions. (Pradhan 2011)

The logical frame work approach started in early 1960s in response to planning and monitoring of development projects (Pradhan, 2011). The first logical frame developed was for USAID at the end of 1960s and NORAD made a significant contribution in 1990s Pradhan, (2011).

According to Milika (2011), the logical frame work helps to analyse an existing situation like, including the identification of stakeholders’ needs and the definition of related objectives, establish a causal link between inputs, activities, results, purpose and overall objective; (vertical logic), define the assumptions on which the project logic builds; identify the potential risks for achieving objectives and purpose; establish a system for monitoring and evaluating a communication and learning process among the stakeholders; like clients or beneficiaries, planners, decision- makers and implementers. It also considers strength weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT).
According to Milika (2011) LFA has several advantages like; (i) it ensures that fundamental questions are asked and weaknesses are analysed, in order to provide decision makers with better and more relevant information, (ii) it guides systematic and logical analysis of the interrelated key elements which constitute a well-designed project, (iii) it improves planning by highlighting linkages between project elements and external factors. (iv) it provides a better basis for systematic monitoring and evaluation analysis of the effects of projects. (v) it facilitates common understanding and better communication between decision makers, managers and other parties involved in the project, (vi) ensures management and administration benefit from standardized procedures for collecting and assessing information. Milka (2011) states that LFA ensures continuity of approach when original project staff is replaced.

According to Nyandemo (2010), logical framework is essential it is the first step in project planning and implementation Nyandemo further observes that logical framework requires under taking three main tasks: (i) the objectives or goals clearly stated, (ii) the target group or beneficiaries clearly stated, and (iii) the time frame showing when the costs and when benefits are likely to occur. It improves planning by highlighting linkages.

Attempts to utilize the LFA in the region have been observed in countries such as Ghana where JMK consultants were contracted by Denmark to assist the LFA workshop in Ghana. It sought to establish a consensus in Ghana and its member organizations about development program with the LEV national association to enable Ghana build their capacity to handle its role as an advocacy organization. This would enable the country to design projects using logical framework planning approach with overall and immediate objectives, indicators, target groups’ analysis is undertaking, (JMK, 2014). To be a huge step taken by Ghana in the implementation of projects.
In furtherance on the above approach Leuzzi (2013), indicates that a major component of logical frame is the formulation of a Logical Frame work Matrix based on goals, purpose and activities of the project are itemized in the logical framework matrix while logical framework is a more evaporate presentation that explains all components of a project logical framework matrix is in a table form that can be read at a glance by the relevant user. These are shown in table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 – logical frame work matrix.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>YPRAE –PCM- E. Leuzzi (2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative summary</td>
<td>Verifiable indicators (ovl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The log frame matrix is a participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation tool whose power dependence of the degree to which it incorporates the full range of views of intended beneficiaries (Leuzzi, 2013). It also incorporates others who have a stake in the programme design it is a tool summarizing the key features of a programme and is used to help programme designers and stakeholders. LFA gives a blue print that should be followed to arrive at the designation within specified time. Whereas most of the project planners emphasize the inclusion of log frame in the project plans, this is contrary to the existing scenarios on the ground. There is need to incorporate the M& E system with clear indicators land targets consequently, the government should also consider allocation of adequate funds for an effective in M& E process in the implementation of CDF projects, (Wabwire, 2010). In addition WBG (1996), asserts that if log frame and log frame matrix are formulated and adhered to, they can play a significant role in project planning and implementation hence its viability and completion in most cases project planners emphasize strategic plan without
giving logical framework the weight it deserves. Often this impacts negatively on project completion. The study aims at giving logical framework the key position. It deserves in the process of project planning implementation and completion.

2.2.3 Budget and project completion

According to the GFOA (2006) sustainability is meeting the needs of present without comprising the ability of the future generations to meeting their own needs. Project completion is the first step towards project sustainability. The ICLEI, (1990), identifies three interrelated bases of sustainability which encompass environment, social equity and economic factors as shown in the Figure 2.2.

![Diagram of sustainability components](image)

**Figure 2.1:** Components of project completion and sustainability;

Source: ICLEI.

In project management, financial sustainability is the ability of the project to manage itself financially. Consequently completion goals should be fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process. Specific actions that should be undertaken include: The consideration of full lifecycle costs in making investment decisions. Full lifecycle costing considers the affordability of an investment over the short, medium, and long term, from initial acquisition to disposal. For example, a more efficient technology may cost more up-front, but have a
better long-term impact according to (ICLEI, 1990). Lifecycle costing should be applied to both capital and operating investments. The budgeting system should encourage decisions that prevent outcomes that negatively impact completion goals.

To ensure the above, it is important to supplement budgeting with methods that systematically improves efficiency. The budget process is an ideal forum for systematically identifying efficiency opportunities. The finance manager can promote process improvement methods that take place outside budgeting, but that will ultimately have a positive impact on the budget.

In addition, ICLEL (1990) explains that creation of the right incentives is encouraged. Here it is desired to promote budget policies to encourage departments to invest in efficiency. For example, a policy that rewards departments for reducing energy consumption will provide a better incentive than one that immediately turns the savings over to central control. In this case it is desired to allow the department to invest its first year energy savings in a short-term project that have direct benefits to the department.

Promote analysis of intergenerational equity and socio-economic equity in capital investment and financing. Make sure the capital improvement planning process takes into account issues such as balancing investments between different geographic areas of the community and when a capital asset is paid for versus when it is consumed. Nyandemo, (2010) observes that in order for the project budgeting to be meaningful and viable it must satisfy several conditions arising from overall corporate consideration that includes, consistence with long range plans of the project, be compatible with resources available, controllable and endorsed by executive management.

In addition, the integration of resiliency into capital project evaluations is very desirable. Resilient systems reduce; the probabilities of failure; the consequences of failure such as deaths and injuries, physical damage, and negative economic and social effects; the time for
recovery (Nyahemo, 2010). ICLEI further states that the objective of a capital planning system should be to maximize an asset’s resistance to extreme events and minimize the time required for recovery while, of balancing against costs Resiliency complements completion because a resilient asset will be in a better position to serve future generations of constituents than a non-resilient one.

ICLEI further emphasizes that regular update long-range financial plans and forecasts. Long-range financial plans and forecasts are an important tool for ensuring that a government’s cost structure and service strategies are economically and financially sustainable and should be updated on a regular basis.

It is imperative to draw a balance sheet of successful projects and failed projects and identify and categorize the failed projects. Malfunction of a single component of the project can affect the whole project, thus the need for tackling every component of the project as continuity and of sustainable strategy (ICEL 1990). This helps to charter project successfully and all must be expertly managed to deliver the on time and on budget results.

Kenya’s new constituency approach with specific reference to the CDF Act 2013 encourages public participation on the CDF committee, taking to account the geographical diversity within the constituency, communal, religious, social and cultural interests in the constituency and the requirement of gender youth and representation of persons with disabilities. Wabwire (2010), recommends promotion of overall government transparency and accountability in CDF budgets and expenditure programs through disclosure to the public. This will make them recognize their right to know how tax revenues are spent. The government should enforce the exercise of periodic audits to increase accountability of the fund.

Wabwire (2010), further observes that citizen participation in development programs is the key objective for sustainability of CDF projects mentions factors that affects the community participation like lack of transparency and transitional plans for committee members,
especially due to interference by members of parliament, general lack of adequate knowledge on project planning by beneficences and nonexistent publicity at constituency level. There is great need for the government to ensure that relevant project documents are available for public scrutiny these includes project proposals, expenditure budgets project progress reports and democratized CDF implementing committees allowing public to participant in their selection.

The pitfall in the 2013 Act remains that the MP still retains power to appoint the committee members. The CDF ranks the projects in order of priority in terms short term and along term. The projects have to be communal in nature. The local authority delivery action plan (LSDAP, 2,000) was introduced in order to enhance citizen participation in identifying their priorities and streamline the planning process to encourage the development of capital plans and enhance accountability. National Tax payers Association (NTA) audits of projects but does not spell out a clear M&E plan although it is emphasized that the governor should formulate M&E system that in cooperate key performance indicators and means of verifying. It does not comprehensively spell out components of M&E and budget audit.

2.2.4: Stakeholders analysis and project completion

According to Milika, (2011), basic premise behind stakeholder analysis is that different groups have different concerns, capacities and interests and that these need to be explicitly understood and recognized. This is done during the process of problem identification, objective setting and strategy selection, implementation and completion. The stakeholder analysis matrix and strength, weakness, opportunity and treats SWOT analysis are among the widely used by donors.

Stakeholder engagement has become increasingly necessary as large and more complex projects are planned and implemented (Gray, 2001). Stakeholders can participate at various
levels of which the lowest is information sharing at a higher level is consultancy for decision making. At higher level the developer can collaborate with stakeholders in each aspect of decision making including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution. At highest level it can empower stakeholders to make final decision as detailed of the interrelations are depicted in Figure 2.1 and explained hereunder.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.2**: Flow chart showing stakeholder engagement plan. Source: Milka (2011).

### 2.2.4.1 Stage holder engagement plan

The flow chart shows the process of involving stake holders from design of desired outcome, scooping process engagement plan process up to final evaluating by involving stakeholder. The desired outcomes influence the methodology of engaging stakeholders in project planning implementation and completion. Milika (2011), further advises that different
participatory methods be designed to produce different types of outcomes, which in turn, determine the final outcomes of the stakeholders engagement exercise. Thus identifying and agreeing to the ‘desired outcomes’ is thus a crucial part of the planning process. It not only helps to select the most appropriate methodology and techniques for engagement but ensures that the overall aims of the engagement exercise are never lost sight of as the project progresses (Milka 2011, IEA, 2006).

2.3.4.2: Scoping process

Milika (2011) further outlines the purpose, scope and context of any stakeholder engagement and how they are interrelated. This is because they are defined to varying degrees from each other. In combination with stakeholder identification they constitute; the “Scoping Process” from which, contingent upon institutional support and “Engagement Plan” so that the stakeholder’s engagement is put in the process. A good purpose will be highly focused with clear aims and objectives, originating from desired outcomes. Such a purpose enables the commissioning body to ensure that the right mechanisms are in place to transform the process outputs into outcomes. Clarifying the purpose ensures that any commissioning body knows what it is getting into and can then check whether “participation” is appropriate.

In line with the view of Mulwa, (2010) stakeholders are expected to take their own decisions. They should make their decisions that donors will abide with and free to choose alternation regular consultation are seen to be healthy among partners a stakeholders involved characterized by respect trust and responsibility. According to chambers (1993), new approach calls for a paradigm shift from conventional approaches to extensions that are fundamentally banking in nature imparting technical knowledge and skills to the local.

Robinson, (2003), observed that Ethiopia government on its part wanted donors to commit funds directly to the budget support without M&E sustainable development and poverty reduction program (SDPRP). The aim of the project was to build local capacity such that
models can be built and updated in the future. These projects were formally guided by high level national advisory committee composed of key stakeholders and potential consumers and beneficiaries of the project in the hope of achieving expected impact. It was subject to country wide view of stakeholders and beneficiaries. The project was further subjected to internal project evaluation and review schemes of both Ethiopia Development Research Institute (EDRU) and Institute of Development Studies (IDS) with aim of identifying indicators and milestones of achievements as project overall success. In this particular case emphasis was put on role of stakeholders be it at national regional or community level. However stakeholders were consider separately from other tools of M&E. In line with the view, MDGs emphasize this as a very important step. One of the MDG’s is environmental sustainability and a global partnership to development this can only be achieved by utilization of M&E tools in projects implementation and sustainability. Consequently, most nations have formulated their strategies to attain sustainability in their operations.

Kenya has put in place both institutional and legal framework to help drive the principles of sustainability. For example, Kenya’s Vision 2030 is the country long term development blue print which aims to create a globally competitive and prosperous country providing a high quality of life for all its citizens. It aspires to transform Kenya into a newly industrialized middle income country by 2030 and emphasizes sustainability. Towards this, the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES), has been mandated to track progress of the implementation of the vision. Kenya’s constitution clearly stipulates how communities will be engaged in development through representation in the county government hence the devolved system of governance that is all inclusive. Stakeholder involvement is one strategy of involving community participation raises awareness, or knowledge, and helps to ensure prioritization of CDF funded projects. To realize this phenomena CDF management needs to intensify their public awareness campaigns through workshops, education tours and public
meetings. The foregoing this, the M & E tools are not given any significance as expected. However NIMES role is Monitoring and Evaluation development projects in the entire republic should be emphasized. They should work with other sectors such as relevant ministries which should in turn facilitate by availing guidelines such as adherence to the estimates for construction in the bill of quantities as approved in the strategic plan.

Kariuki (2013), in his findings noted that high education level contributes towards understanding of the different facets of government policies. It emerged that people with low income tend to exhibit high levels of participation to supplement their annual income. Seemingly high literacy levels increase the ability to communicate effectively ultimately generating easy in participation. He further stressed the need for adherence to structured leadership selection criteria based on academic qualifications, leadership skills and adherence to stipulated process of selecting committee members. Cognizant of the above, it is imperative that local people should actively engage with CDF management

This is in line with the commitment of the government as manifested in the increase in funding of CDF project over time. For example table 2.2 shows significant growth from 2003/2004 to 2013/2014. From the foregoing it is evident that CDF projects have a key role to play national development. The funding is steadily rising and therefore it requires well-coordinated M&E process where M&E tools are applied. For example funding for Malava has grown from ksh.11,200,000.00 (2003/2004) to ksh. 105,327,275.00 (2013/2014) and Navakholo/ Lurambi has grown from ksh. 6,000,000.00(2013/2014) to ksh. 116,836,549.00 (2013/2014). Other constituencies are detailed in the Table 2.2 such large sum of fund from tax payer should be put to proper use.
Table 2.2: Trends in CDF funding of the constituencies in Kakamega county since 2003: Source CDF office

Financial years
2.3 Conceptual framework

Independent Variables (Use of M&E tools)

- **Strategic plan**
  - Existence of strategic plan
  - Adherence to the strategic plan

- **Log frame**
  - Existence of logical framework
  - How it is used in project implementation
  - Analysis approach time bound

- **Budget**
  - Formulation of budget
  - Adherence to budget guidelines
  - Adherence to budget controls
  - Auditing

- **Stakeholder’s Analysis**
  - Existence of stakeholder’s analysis
  - Scoping process
  - Establishing stakeholders involvement
  - How important were they in the analysis
  - Participatory role

Intervening Variables

- Policy changes, politics

- Project completion
- The actual level of Project Completion According to the strategic plan of the project

Dependent Variables

- Economic changes, education level

Moderating variables

---

**Figure 2.1**: Conceptual framework source: Researcher, 2014

Independent variables are represented by the M&E tools that are Strategic Plan, Logical Framework, Budget and Stakeholder Analysis. The dependent variable is project completion. Intervening and moderating variables have an impact on project completion comprise political environment policy, economics and social settings amongst others. For example, interference by the political leaders who control CDF funding’s interferes with the completion of the project as scheduled as stipulated in the budget, especially when there is
change of MP to another in the constituency. The government policy has also featured whereby there is no further funding after the completion of the project. Neither can the stakeholder who will do voluntary work can be supported financially. The social – economic factor also featured whereby poverty affects the support that is expected from the community. Education level affects the ability of some of the project management committee member during their normal duties. According to Kariuki (2013) high literacy levels increase the ability to communicate effectively ultimately generating easy in participation.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter considers the methodological procedure for the project research. The projected
research process, includes, research design, target population, sampling. Research
instruments, methods of data collection, methods of data analysis and ethical issues.

3.2 Research design
The study employed a descriptive survey design and a correlation design. The descriptive
survey design was used because according to Best etal (2003) this design enables one to
capture all pertinent aspects of a situation while employing a unit study and investigation.

The correlation design allowed the researcher to compare the completion rates of the projects
with the use of the various M&E tools.

3.3 Target population
The study was conducted in Kakamega County, comprised of twelve sub- counties namely
Kakamega North, Kakamega Central, Kakamega South, Kakamega East, Matete, Likuyani,
Lugari, Butere Matungu, Mumias, Khwisero and Navakholo. It borders Ausin Gishu and
Nandi in East, Trans- Nzoia to the North East, Siaya to the south. Siaya to the south west and
Busia to the west as detailed on Figure 3.1 GoK, (2008)
Four constituencies from Kakamega County were randomly sampled for the study and these are Malava, Butere, Navakholo and Lurambi. The target population was comprised of the members of CDF projects committee’s members from the four constituencies, Ministry of Works and Health officers and other community leaders.

CDF projects with budget estimates that exceed 1 million shillings between the years 2003 – 2013 were identified in Kakamega County and targeted for the study. They amounted to a total of 630. Each project was managed and implemented by 8 committee members. The total target population of committee members was 630 x 8 = 5040. The details of where the target population was got are summarized in – Figure 3.1 and Table 3.1.

Figure 3.1 Appendix A: Map of Kakamega County: Source, Wikipedia
Table 3.1: Constituencies and number of projects costing more than one million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituencies</th>
<th>Bursary</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Total project (bursaries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lurambi, Navakholo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikolomani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwisero</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugari, Likuyani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malava</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matungu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinyalu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mumias E mumias W and Butere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure

3.4.1 Sample size

The study utilized both probabilistic and non-probabilistic random sampling, to arrive at a sample size of four constituencies and purposeful sampling was used to sample five projects from each of the four constituencies.

In this particular study as preferred number of constituencies to be used in sample was four using the formula by Yamane (1967).

As follows

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

Equation 3.1

Where \( n \) is the sample size

\( N \) is preferred sample size and

\( e \) is the error = 0.05

\[
n = \frac{4}{1+4(0.05)^2}
\]

\( = 3.96 \)

Availed sample size of four (4).
3.4.2: Sampling procedure

The projects were from the health facilities, community water projects administration offices, education institutions identified in the field as they were the main CDF funded projects, five projects were purposely sampled from each of the four constituencies, and they are given in Table 3.2. Each project was managed by a committee of 8 members. The preferred numbers of committee members was randomly sampled using Yamane (1967) formula for sample size, resulting into five committee members who were randomly sampled from each of PMCs. This gave a sample size of 5x4x5 = 100 respondents. Other respondents were purposely sampled from: community leaders, Ministries of Works, Education, and Health, totaling 20 respondents. Overall total of the respondents was 120.

Table 3.2: Selected projects sample matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAVAKHOLE</th>
<th>LURAMBI</th>
<th>BUTERE</th>
<th>MALAVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>Project 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namirama Girls,</td>
<td>Muslim Secondary</td>
<td>Buchenya Girls</td>
<td>Bukhakunga Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer centre.</td>
<td>School. Twin lab.</td>
<td>classrooms</td>
<td>School. classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. time 2008 –</td>
<td>Est. time 2012-2014,</td>
<td>Est. time 2010-2011</td>
<td>Est. time 2012-2013,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013, budget 28m</td>
<td>budget 31m</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>budget 1.4m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebuyusi High</td>
<td>Ikonyero Secondary</td>
<td>Bukenya Water Project</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School. Resource</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>Emayuke Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre</td>
<td>Est. time 2012-2013,</td>
<td>Est. time 2004-2013,</td>
<td>Dispensary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18m</td>
<td>tuition block, budget</td>
<td>6.4m</td>
<td>Est. time 2008-2009,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>budget 2.5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingotse High,</td>
<td>Emukaba AP Camp</td>
<td>Butere Polytechnic</td>
<td>Project 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, library</td>
<td>Est. time 2010 -2011,</td>
<td>Est. time 2010-2011</td>
<td>Samitsi Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18m</td>
<td>budget 1.6m.</td>
<td>budget 2m.</td>
<td>Est. time 2008-2009,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>budget 2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinoi High School,</td>
<td>Sakali health</td>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>Project 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose &amp;</td>
<td>Mayakalo dispensary</td>
<td>Shitsitswi Health</td>
<td>Shiting’ong’o Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinning hall.</td>
<td>Est. time 2011-2012,</td>
<td>Centre Est. times 2008 – 2009 budget</td>
<td>dispensary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21m</td>
<td>budget 4m.</td>
<td>4.5m.</td>
<td>Est. time 2010-2011,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>Project 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ematia Health</td>
<td>Jinja corner AP</td>
<td>Shisaba Health</td>
<td>Embiakalo Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispensary</td>
<td>Camp.</td>
<td>Dispensary</td>
<td>Dispensary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. time 2006-2007,</td>
<td>Est. time 2011-2012,</td>
<td>Est. time 2007 -2008,</td>
<td>Est. time 2012-2013,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5m</td>
<td>budget 4m.</td>
<td>budget 4.5m.</td>
<td>budget 11m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Data collection instruments

Data was collected by use of check lists, questionnaire, interview schedules and document analysis.

3.5.1 Primary data

Primary data of both quantitative and qualitative type was collected by the researcher through observation checklist, interview schedules and questionnaire’s. Interview schedules were used to interview key informants. The respondents answered identical questions according to the category stated. For example Committee members responded to specific questionnaire designed accordingly, Ministry officials, CDF officers heads of institutions community leaders, responded to questionnaire designed for schedule interviews. Researcher established position image with respondents in order to set deeper information on the topic. Using this approach and produced good results.

3.5.2 Secondary Data

Secondary data was sourced through documents analysis. Amongst documents analysed comprised CDF Act (2013), projects strategic plans, journals, government policy documents and relevant texts.

3.6 Validity

According to Phelan (2005) validity refers to the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure. Criterion validity is used to ensure that the measured is actually what is intended to measure and no other variables. My supervisor(s) and experts examined the items and had their expert input. They supervised their suitability against the set objectives.
3.7 Reliability

According to Phelan (2005) reliability is the degree to which an assessment tool produces stable and consistent results. It is an assessment of the reproducibility and consistency of an instrument. Using qualitative methods respondents asked questions about the pilot study, how long they will take to fill questionnaire and information about cover letter and clarity of questions. This was done by pilot testing using the questionnaire in Shinyalu constituency, a constituency where the actual data collection was not done. The changes after pilot outcomes were incorporated into the instruments which were adjusted accordingly.

3.8 Methods of data analysis

Data was analysed both descriptively and inferentially. Descriptive analysis included computation of means, relations, coordination and correlations between dependent and independent variables. Chi square ($X^2$) was used to test hypothesis. This was because quantitative data was of non-parametric nature. Chi square ($X^2$) was calculated using the formula below;

$$X^2 = \frac{n}{\sum \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}}$$

Equation 3.2

O - Observed

E – Expected

Significance levels depending on the data collected was used SPSS and Microsoft office suit, were used, the results were tested at 5% level of significance.

Influence of M&E tools on project completion tested. Using chi- square test data from key informants was used summarized in the table 3.3.
Table 3.3: chi – square ($x^2$) test statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the extent to which completion level of project has been influenced by strategic plan</th>
<th>the extent to which completion level of project has been influenced by logical framework</th>
<th>the extent to which completion level of project has been influenced by stakeholders analysis</th>
<th>the extent to which completion level of project has been influenced by budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>39.538&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23.231&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63.385&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48.769&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asamp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 10.4.

b) 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 13.0.

From the table the $X^2$ values worked are highly significant and shown that there is significant positive influence of all the four tools on the project completion. The results are discussed in detail in chapter four.
3.9 Operationalization of variables

Table 3.4 Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish extent to which use of strategic plan influence level of project completion.</td>
<td>Use of strategic plan</td>
<td>Level of project completion</td>
<td>Adherence to plan, operational project</td>
<td>Ordinal correlation ratio</td>
<td>Descriptive analysis correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess how the use of logical framework influences the level of project completion.</td>
<td>Use of logical framework</td>
<td>Level of project completion</td>
<td>Adherence time and schedule</td>
<td>Ordinal ration</td>
<td>Correlation document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate how budgeting influence the level of project completion</td>
<td>Use of budget</td>
<td>Level of project completion</td>
<td>Change in budget</td>
<td>Original budget in relation to current budget</td>
<td>Budget variation correlation ratios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess how stakeholder analysis influence the level of completion</td>
<td>Use of stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>Level of project completion</td>
<td>Involvement in planning and implementation</td>
<td>Proportion ratio correlation</td>
<td>Correlation Document analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10 Ethical Issues

Authority to conduct the research was sourced via permit to conduct research. The respondents were informed that whatever they would say would only be used for research purpose. Research was carried without bias, respected the confidentiality of information from respondents. A research permit was sought from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. (NACOSTI).

3.11 Summary

This chapter considered the research design clearly defined target population and sampling procedure that was used. Methods of data collection specifically checklists; questionnaire, interviews and document analysis were further explained in this chapter. The validity and
reliability of instruments of data collection were tested accordingly. It specifies how Data was analyzed concludes with the ethical considerations that were captured.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1: Introduction

The study was to examine how M&E tools influence CDF project completion in Kakamega County. This was done by testing variables through purposely selected projects from each of the four randomly sampled constituencies in the county. The themes were; the influence of strategic plan on project completion, influence of logical framework on project completion, influence of the budget on project completion and influence of stakeholder’s analysis on project completion. This chapter therefore presents the results of statistics analysis, presentation, interpretation and discussion.

4.2: Questionnaire return rate

A total of 120 questionnaires were sent out. One hundred and six (106) were returned translating to 88% return rate. The high return rate has been as result of making several visits to the sites to make sure most of the respondents return the questionnaires. Most of these who could not respond were said to be inactive or irregular. Researcher also conducted KIIs for all stakeholders as discussed under section 3.5. A total of 52 KIIs and 54 committee members were interviewed. Observation checklists were also used by the researcher on the actual existing scenarios on the ground.

4.3: Features of social demographic

The major features of demographic importance that were considered important in the study were gender and education level.

4.3.1: Gender

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender so that participation according to gender is analysed and discussed.

The gender of the committee members was established as indicated in Table 4.1.
Table: 4.1: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were 75.5% male and 24.5% female, in effect representation of female was low in the committee members. This underrepresentation may impact negatively on the operations of these committees. This is because certain gender requirements may not be addressed with such under representation. This is in conformity with findings of a survey contacted by Haa.. (2014) that gender mainstreaming in all sectors of the development ensured an all-inclusive approach.

4.3.2: Education level

The respondents’ education level was analysed and the outcome is as indicated in Table 4.2

Table: 4.2: Academic Level of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A level</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic levels were reflected in percentage as primary 5.6% ; secondary 24.5% A- level 6.6%; diploma holder 37.7%; graduate 19.8%; posts graduate 4.7% and others featured at only 0.1%. They expressed the need to have educated Project Management Committee members (PMCs) who can be able to manage and participate in M&E of the projects. The education level of members of the committees is very important. Kariuki (2013) in his findings noted that education level contributes towards understanding to the different facets
of Government policies, high literacy levels increase the ability to communicate effectively ultimately generating easy in participation. Educated committee members are more likely to respond by taking measures as education is expected to increase one’s ability to receive decode and understand information relevant to making innovative decisions. Committee members without required knowledge face barriers limiting their opportunity to innovate. The education level knowledge and capacities of committee members should be properly valued as it should be the starting point in constituting membership of such committees.

4.4: Influence of Monitoring & Evaluation tools on project completion.

Project management committee members were given questionnaires to fill and assess all the monitoring and evaluation tools. The results were analysed by summarizing in frequency tables, percentages, correlations and chi-square in line with respective objectives of the study. Findings from key informants and observation checklist were equally triangulated into the rest of the findings.

A Table 4.3 summarizes correlations computed to establish how the respondents perceived the extent of utilization of the four M&E tools has influenced project completion.
Table 4.3: Computed correlations between strategic plan, logical framework, budget and stakeholders from the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>extend to which completion level of project has been influenced by strategic plan</th>
<th>extend to which completion level of project has been influenced by logical framework</th>
<th>extend to which completion level of project has been influenced by stakeholders analysis</th>
<th>extend to which completion level of project has been influenced by budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the extent to which completion level</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of project has been influenced by</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic plan</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the extent to which completion level</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of project has been influenced by</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical framework</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the extent to which completion level</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of project has been influenced by</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders analysis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the extent to which completion level</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of project has been influenced by</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings indicate there is a positive correlation between monitoring and evaluation tools.

For example correlation between strategic plan and logical framework is 0.526 much for above 0.
The results are consistent within worked $X^2$ findings in the subsequent tables in this chapter thus M&E tools have significant influence on CDF project completion in Kakamega County. This was determined from the responses of the committee members and the KIIs. Table 4.4 and 4.5 respectively.

Seemingly this is in line with WBG (1996) which established that M&E is indispensable tool of project and portfolio management; it provides a basis of sustainability. Findings and discussions from each tool are discussed here under.

### 4.4.1. Influence of strategic plan on project completion.

Committee members were interviewed about the influence of strategic plan on project completion they were given an opportunity to select from lowest scale of very low to highest rating of very high the results. Their responses to various components is in Table 4.4 showing frequency and percentages.

**Table 4.4. Strategic plan findings from committee members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages and frequency (f.)</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Budget in the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the time schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation in Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to Project management chart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders analysis – report Contractor requirement and conditions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of Project Completion. Relation to Project Plan Application of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation reports in relation to Project Completion Quality of Project Implementation Future development Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F – Frequency % Percentage
From Table 4.4, the findings are explained systematically according to each of the components embodied in typical strategic plan.

**4.4.1.1 Inclusion of budget in the strategic plan**

The component of budget in strategic plan was addressed; the respondents noted the role budget plays during the project implementation and completion. They responded appropriately using the scales provided in the questionnaire. Fifty three point seven (53.7%) percent expressed that inclusion of the budget in the strategic plan had high influence on project completion. This was further supported from responses from KIIIs comprised of heads on institutions and Ministry officials. The respondents strongly felt inclusion of budget in the strategic plan was crucial. It was noted that due to irregular and underfunding most of the projects had stalled. Political influence was a critical intervening factor. It emerged that the respondents would prefer an all-inclusive budget that goes beyond bill of quantities.

**4.4.1.2. Adherence to the time schedule**

Adherence to the plan was a realistic practical approach to project implementation process. Seventy two (72%) percent observed that there was need to adhere to the time schedule during project implementation. This they observed impacted on the completion time. They expressed that when the project takes longer than it was initially scheduled it becomes very expensive by the time of completion.

**4.4.1.3. Inclusion of monitoring & evaluation in strategic plan**

The component tested whether M&E had influence on project completion; it was noted that M&E should be part of strategic plan with clearly defined time lines a total of 51.9% of the responded in the affirmative. They recommended that the process should be all inclusive involving all stakeholders such as (PMCs) and community leaders. They further observed that both internal and external mechanisms of M&E should be considered in the strategic plan. Most respondents indicated that the strategic plan guides the project management
committee, enhances quality of performance and improves on the utilization of resources. Consequently, the strategic plan should explicitly show at what stages M&E will be undertaken. Inconformity the PMC would prefer to undertake capacity building workshops and seminars in order to be more effective.

4.4.1.4. Adherence to project management chart

Project management chart shows the chain of command on how PMC members should relate to each in terms of responsibilities. Fifty one point nine (51.9%) of the respondents felt that adherence to the project plan should be mandatory in order for the project implementation to run smoothly. Information from checklists revealed that that about 50% of stalled projects had no the provisions of the project management chart that addressed aspects of management, time frame amongst others. It clearly emerged that PMC other KIIIs would prefer a well-defined project management plan.

4.4.1.5. Stakeholders’ analysis – report

Stakeholders who dominate the PMC are expected to produce their own M&E reports. Respondents were asked how seriously do they scale the importance of stakeholders reports. Fifty one point nine percent (51.9%) expressed those stakeholders reports should be part of the strategic planning. This was because they observed that urgent matters were addressed at this point in time during project implementation to avoid stalling of the projects. Consequently, they can make recommendations such as variation of mode of funding, change the contractor that contravenes the statutes and address other shortfalls promptly. The funds should be released in installments that can enable PMC to complete the project in time. Respondents observed that where stakeholder’s reports are not adhered to, contactors tend to contravene terms and conditions especially regarding quality of materials and workmanship. In such cases poor quality work was observed.
4.4.1.6. Contractor requirement and conditions

Contractor should work under certain specific terms and conditions which can be easily assessed using M&E tools. The strategic plan should have details of specifications expected. These should be in the strategic plan hence the overwhelming 79.6% respondents indicated high and very high preference for it. Adherence to specifications would be ensure expected outcomes in scheduled timeframe. In essence would eliminate blame game between contractor, PMC, ministries of works and CDF management over shortfalls that may arise. As a result the implementation would be smooth and project would be completed within scheduled time.

4.4.1.7. Extent of project completion

Extent of project completion was a concern by all stakeholders including the financier, CDF managements, PMC, and community. It was noted that good strategic plan should show stages of completion at the stakeholders should evaluate and give a report. Thus a strategic plan should indicate the extent of project completion was perceived to be very crucial as it assists stakeholders to monitor and evaluate different stages of progress. This is because it can be reference by CDF which can influence further funding. Seventy four percent (74%) indicated high to very high preference. It would make it easier to reflect completion level in relation to the budget. It was noted that the level of completion would affect timelines and budget adjustment. This was evident in stalled projects like Plate E2.

4.4.1.8. Relation to project plan

Implementation of a project should reflect time lines and budget estimate so that way forward can be discussed by stakeholders. If implementation of a project is not related to the plan in most cases it was haphazard in nature and leaves stakeholder without a tool to challenge the neither contractor nor CDF management for regular funding. Consequently 51.9% preferred very high scale. They underscored the need for making use of the strategic plan all the time.
As result accountability M&E can be systematically executed. Seemingly that would improve on project management during implementation.

4.4.1.9. Application of M&E reports in relation to project completion

It was revealed that most of PMCs hardly receive M&E reports. They were not involved in the exercise normally verbally briefed about the results. Fifty one point nine (51.9%) percent indicated that the involvement in routine M&E by other stakeholders such as those from the government ministries was very crucial. M&E reports from this exercise would have impact on project completion as they would give updates on the progress of the projects. They also monitor the internal M&E of the same. Respondents further felt that these reports should be harmonized with the PMC proceedings so that they augment each other. Normally Ministry of works audits the work in stages during implementation process and CDF office does its monitory and evaluation ones in a while. The parliamentary public finance committee audits but rarely. The three institutions do not complement each other hence resulting disorderly M&E activities. PMCs strongly felt that they needed the reports so that they can take mitigating steps if necessary. It was reveal that at times the personal assistant of the MP does M&E and present his findings to the MP. At the same time is a member of CDF M&E committee.

4.1.10 Quality of project implementation

It emerged that the quality of work during project implementation is the concern of both PMCs and the financier (CDF management). Respondents underscored the importance of quality of work and could show the state of buildings in terms of quality that was 88.9% preferred it in at high and very high. Most of the stalled projects were labour option projects with low quality of workmanship. For example stalled project at Ingotse High School (plate E5) Full contract projects controlled by CDF office were better done for example Shitsitswi Health Centre (Plate E4) in Butere constituency. Thus the quality of workmanship was
concern of every respondent. It was revealed that the quality of work affects the services of offered by the project and its sustainability.

4.1.11. Future development plan

It was noted that most of the projects do not include future developments plans in the strategic plans for example most the health facilities do not include maternity in their strategic plans. Seventy nine point six (79.6%) percent preferred future development plans to be part of strategic plan For example most of the health facilities under this programme required future expansion to include maternity needs, AP camps could be expanded to include offices for; assistant chiefs, agricultural officers amongst others. However this was not the case as they had not included them in their strategic plans. Budgets for extensions and was rarely approved and funded. By Parliamentary Public Finance Committee (PPFC) to avoid such situations. Should include future development plan in their project strategic plan. Key informants were interviewed during as scheduled in a conducive environment, the findings are presented in table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Strategic plan frequencies and percentages from KII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency and percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Age Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.5, eighty eight point eight percent (88.8%) preferable strategic plan as high to very high influence on project completion. It was a tool that should be applied during project
implementation and completion. Most of the projects where implementation had not adhered to project plan had stalled as evidenced by Plate E2 and E6. It was noted that the original plan was to complete the project within three years. However, at the time of this study, these projects had taken more than three years without even completing ground floor. The CDF office treated it as an ongoing project. Inspite of that the respondent noted that CDF funding is good if well managed. Findings from kills was inconformity with findings from committee members. it was noted that strategic plan has influence on project completion.

4.4.12. Hypotheses testing

Key informants participated in a scheduled interview whereby they gave their views and rating of the four M&E tools influence on project completion. The findings from key informants were used to test hypotheses on influence of strategic plan on project completion as follows:

Null hypothesis - Ho: The application of strategic plan had no influence on the level of project completion.

Alternative hypothesis - Ha: application of strategic plan had influence on the level of project completion.

Chi-square test was used to test correlation.

Using the chi-square test of the statistic availed the results Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Strategic plan influence on project completion findings from the KIIs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>$d^2$</th>
<th>$d^2/10.4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>6.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>2.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>5.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>43.56</td>
<td>4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>213.16</td>
<td>20.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = n-1 = 5-1 = 4$ where $F$ is degrees of freedom
At 5% level 9.488

Calculated value 39.588

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} = \sum \frac{d_i^2}{N} = 70.50 + \frac{29.16}{10.4} + \frac{54.76}{10.4} + \frac{43.56}{10.4} + \frac{213.16}{10.4}$$

$$= 39.538$$

Standard tables of $X^2$ give a value of 9.488 at 5% level with 4 degrees of freedom. Yet the calculate value is 39.538 is much higher than the calculated table value. The results show the correlation is significance hence the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This implies of strategic plan had positive influence project completion. Most of PMC would like to be involved in the formulation of strategic plans and receive adequate funds from CDF in time to implement the projects.

The findings were inconformity with United Nations Officer of Project Services UNOPS (2013) requirement that strategic plan, energy and resources that employees and other stakeholders are working towards a common goal. UNOPS branches should in cooperate three dimensions of sustainability that sustainable management, sustainable infrastructure and sustainable procurement. Bryson (1995) states that strategic planning is a technical approach which ‘fuses’ political and technical concerns it fuses planning and decision making.

In line with the findings Schilder (1997) observed that success efforts involve stakeholders whose support you must be assured of. Strategic plan development requires consideration and articulation of values and priorities. The plan should reflect views expressed by all those involved in the process. The process should involve managers, providers, legislators and the public in articulation of visions. These findings were inconformity with government policy on CDF where the strategic plan formulation should involve stakeholders, CDF office before it was presented to parliamentary public finance committee where it goes through screening.
4.4.2 Influence of logical framework on project completion.

A number of PMC were not clear about logical framework. However after explanation it emerged that they were familiar with its components. Their response to various components is summarized in Table 4.7. The findings from the respondents were tabled and analysed accordingly. The findings from committee members in Table 4.7 and findings from key informants are in Table 4.8.

Table 4.7: Influence of logical framework on project completion findings from committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of application of Logical Framework</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>6 11.1</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28 51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical framework as a Projection of Project implementation and Completion</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1 33 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of input in the Logical Framework e.g. material, labour</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>7 13.0</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9 30 55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of the expected output or the Logical Frame work. E.g. clinic will be for treatment of patients.</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2 31 57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of time schedule of Project outcomes e.g. science laboratory will be a good results in science</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.5 27 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of activities in the Logical Framework e.g. contraction, procurement.</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>f22</td>
<td>40.7 24 44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Logical Framework Matrix in relation to strategic plan.</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>11 20.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.0 19 35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations in relation to Logical Framework.</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>20 37.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F – Frequency and % – Percentages

Each component of logical framework has been analysed according to the findings from the respondents.

Thus Influence of logical framework on project completion was very clear from the frequency and percentages. Table 4.9 the findings have been analyzed according to the responses from the key informants interviews (KII). Forty six point two (46.2%) rated
logical frame as very high 36.5% rated as high, translating to a total 82.7%. Responses from KIIIs are shown in Figure 4.8. They show high preference to very high and high. That was consistent with respondents a strategic plan. From Table 4.7, the findings were explained systematically according to each of the variables embodied in typical Logical framework

4.4.2.1 Extent of application of Logical Framework

Logical framework is analytical and systematic approach to project implementation and completion respondents were asked to rate its influence on project completion. Fifty one percent noted that the application logical frame works can fast-track project completion, perceived, as roadmap of the project. They noted that if objectives are well defined specific, measurable, achievable and time bound (SMART) in the logical frame work they will influence PMCs towards a common goal. Logical frame work is what the stakeholders perceive and formulate into a realistic project strategic plan. It is a practical approach to project implementation stakeholders and financiers share vision and mission PMCs would like such approach strengthened and applied by related arms to project implementation process. It was revealed that PMCs would like to be equipped with more knowledge about its components and functions so that they play a significant role its preparation and application.

4.4.2.2 Logical framework as a projection of project

Logical frame work analysis worked out properly in a participatory approach, would give the goals and specific objectives, clearly defined inputs and relevant, activities within specified time lines and show the outcomes at completion of the project. Sixty one point one (61.1%) percent noted that being conversant with aspects of logical frame would make team remain in touch with realities of the project and lead to a projection of its completion. This is an approach that most of the funding organizations now recommend. Therefore, should be worked out involving all stakeholders.
4.4.2.3 Range of input in the logical framework

In puts should be worked out in a realistic manner in view of the project from the implementation stage to completion including building materials, funds, labour, legal fees, ethical and environmental requirements. Fifty five point six (55.6%) percent noted that the range of inputs is very important since it can assist them to implement the project in a realistic way. For example most of community health facilities did not include maternity facilities as stated in the project plan. This is because they were not conversant with logical frame work which is a realistic and practical approach. The inclusion of these entities such as material, labour is very crucial as it ensures project completion. They expressed that there is need for a forum that should involve ministries of works, procurement committee and CDF office for accountability and systematic implementation project. It was revealed that if well worked out will reduce the chances of supplementary budgets.

4.4.2.4 Assessment of the expected output in the logical frame work

Expected output shows the picture of operization of the project after completion, its services and sustainability for example health clinics are clinic where for treatment of patients. Ninety three percent (93%) noted the importance of ensuing expected output as stipulated in logical frame so that they could handle situations that came about during implementation that they could be used for making prompt adjustments. Assessment of expected outputs, outcomes of the project serve as a constant reminder to PMC. The possible benefits of the project if completion within defined times it becomes a driving force. It emerged that most the PMCs do not keenly handle the out puts, they offenly realize at the end of project that certain key components were not included for example equipment, water and electricity, plumbing.
4.4.2.5 Evaluation of time and schedule of project outcomes

The expected outputs and outcomes should be in clear focus since that was the target. It should be very clear to stakeholder’s financiers and community so that all are motivated to achieve the output and the impact there after. Such projects was like the science laboratory, would expect good results in science subjects. Eighty four point four percent scaled high and very high the need be conversant with outcomes of the project since that can motivate them to work harder to complete the project as planned. The respondents were very clear about the importance of time in relations project completion and costs of inputs, since they cannot be separated. It was emphasized that working out a good logical framework should be participatory.

4.4.2.6 Range of activities in the logical framework

Project implementation involves a range of activities that includes land, material enumeration legal requirements, financing and environmental factors. Specific tasks, works and programmes to be undertaken during project lifetime should be well worked out. The strength, weakness, opportunities and threat (SWOT) should be worked to help stakeholders have a clear picture of the project. Eighty five point one (85.1%) observed that activities give a reality of under taking of the project that can contribute to quality and efficiency of implementation of the project. It was emphasized that the activities should show clearly the roles played by say the initiators of the project, CDF management, contractor and others involved during implementation and completion.

4.4.2.7 Application of logical framework matrix in relation to strategic plan

A logical framework matrix is a table that shows all the aspects of logical frame that range from goals, activities, inputs, out puts and projected outcomes. It is a table that should be understood by all concerned. Seventy two (72%) percent preferred to have a logical framework matrix. The tabulations on a matrix can constantly remind the stakeholders
therefore influence project completion. It was observed that logical frame work matrix is a tabulation that shows four rows of overall objective in puts outputs and activities and columns of variable indicators source of verifications (costs) and assumptions. The stakeholders that include PMCs look at logical frame matrix as a pocket dictionary for reference all the time during project implementation. It is a practical interpretation of strategic plan of a project.

**4.4.2.8 Expectations in relation to logical framework**

All stakeholders need to understand and impress all the expectations that appear in the logical frame in order to support the implementation and completion of the project. The committee members found the component benefitting their expectations during project implementations, completion and sustainability. It emerged that findings from KII was in conformity with committee members. It was noted that logical frame had influence on project completion. Ninety point seven (90.7%) percent emphasized expectations role in the completion of the project because this creates unity of purpose and helps them to focus.

To test on how the extent to which completion level of project has been influenced by logical framework, KII responses were analysed and details are shown in Table 4.8

**Table 4.8: Logical framework findings from KII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.9 Hypotheses testing

Key informants participated in scheduled interviews whereby they gave their rating of influence of logical frame work on project completion. The findings were used to test Hypothesis as follows:

Ho: application of logical frame work had no influence the level of project completion.

Ha: application of logical frame work had influence on the level of project completion

Chi-square was used to test results and analyse the hypotheses from the Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Influenced of logical framework on project completion findings from KII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual(d)</th>
<th>d²</th>
<th>d²/13.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = n-1= 4-1 =3 where F is degrees of freedom

\[ X^2 = \sum \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} = \sum \frac{d_i^2}{N} = \frac{64}{13} + \frac{81}{13} + \frac{36}{13} + \frac{121}{13} = 26.831 \] 

Equation……

Table value 7.815

Calculated value 23.631

The standard tables of \(X^2\) give a value 7.815 at 5% level with 3 degrees of freedom. Yet the calculated value is 23.631 was much higher than table value of 7.815.

Calculated value was much higher than table value hence highly significant reject Ho accept Ha that reflects that logical framework had influence on project completion.

The findings were in compliment with research conducted by Milika (2011) which established logical framework as a key tool in project completion. Logical frame work was
important because; it provides decision makers with better and relevant information, it guides systematic and logical analysis of inter related key elements which constitute a well-designed project; and provides a better basis for systematic M&E process. That is why some countries like Ghana have adopted logical frame approach in most of their projects. In Kenya NIMES has been mandated with the task of ensuring that logical framework is adopted in most projects that are being implemented such as those leading to the attainment of attain Vision 2030. Existing literature further collaborates this that logical frame work is essential first step in project planning and implementation showing clearly the objectives target group and time frame which to achieve the benefits, (Nyandemo 2010)

4.4.3 Influence of budget on project completion

Study sought to establish the influence of budget on project completion. Overall picture is that the budget should be reflected in the project plan to succeed.

The frequency and percentage table clearly shows the budget had significant influence in project completion. This is reinforced by the KII in the schedule as shown in in the Table 4.10 and 4.11 that shows the frequencies and percentages from committee members and KII respectively.
Table 4.10: Influence of budget on project completion findings from committee members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity of budget to Project Plan</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely flow of funds</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of adjustment of Project Budget</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Budget during Project implementation services</td>
<td>0 3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual expenditure in relation to bill of quantities.</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of contingencies in the Budget.</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to project Budget e.g. bill of quantity, inclusion of Monitoring &amp;Evaluation Budget</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of budget funds</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive funding from other sources other than CDF</td>
<td>1 25.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit reports</td>
<td>4 3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and explanation were done according to the responses components in Table 4.11 here under.

4.4.3.1 Conformity of budget to project plan

The relationship between budget and strategic plan plays a role in project implementation and completion. Respondents were well informed about it.

From the Table 4.11, 61.1% emphatically scaled budget as a priority, they expressed that most of the projects have stalled for years this because of non-conformity of the budget with the items in the strategic plan. They expressed that unpredictable and irregular CDF funding had interfered with project completion. However, timely flow of funds would be good enough.

Fifty one percent (51%) of the respondents felt that timely flow of the fund would go a long way to contribute to completion of the project in time.

The projects in which most of the respondents are committee members have stalled reflected by 51.9% completion level although some of them were operational especially the health
facilities, you may find a health centre which had budget, but had not planned for maternity services, and hope to put it up when they get funds. Some water projects for community for example lacked the funding for piping the water to members of the community. It clearly shows that all concerned should have a forum that they could have unified approach to achieve a specific target.

4.4.3.2. Timely flow of funds

The flow of funds during the implementation had an influence on the quality of work and time lines of project completion. It was a fact that PMC had to bear with during project implementation.

Seventy seven percent (77%) noted that it was important to release funds in a timely manner because of price changes of materials with time. Most of them preferred the project to be paid in one single installment or at least 50% released at the stand of the project. Most of the stalled projects were due to untimely and irregular funding. It was observed that if the funding takes a long time the project costs go higher.

4.4.3.3 Adherence to the budget during project implementation services

Budget was a key component of strategic plan adherence to it was not an option but mandatory. Adherence to the budget was a realistic implementation of the project as indicated by respondents, 75.9% strongly emphasized adherence to the budget so that the project can be completed as scheduled. Most of them however expressed the problem of political interference. In most cases if a project was exceeding the political term of an MP the next MP was unwillingly to fund it. It emerged that those who do not adhere to the budget do not manage the fund well.
4.4.3.4 Actual expenditure in relation to bill of quantities

It was important that those concerned with implementation of project should work closely with CDF management to ensure consistence during project implementation. The funds should be released by CDF in accordance to specific stages of the project. The first installment should be adequate to complete foundation and flap of the building and second one so much to reach may be window level instead all high school projects being awarded say 1.5 million to continue with own going project with no respect to level of completion. That results into accountability challenges that face CDF projects. Ninety one point five percent (91.5%) and above rated very highly on expenditure in relation to the bill of quantities. It was observed that it was a critical aspect of M&E budget can influence projects completion most of the projects that have stalled it is due mismanagement of funds or under budgeting. Most of the respondents stressed that politicians should be restrained from interfering with the funds. However, key informants expressed that a times PMCs misuse the funds. M&E should be effectively applied to make sure the expenditure is according to bill of quantities.

4.4.3.5 Inclusion of contingencies in the budget

It was noted that in most cases strategic plan was a theoretical workout but practical experience might be a bit different from the expected. Inclusion of contingencies in the budget can ameliorate a situation where there is under budgeting. Seventy nine point six percent (79.6%) rated the phenomena as very high and justified it by observing that this can be due to unforeseen costs during project implementation. Adjustment of CDF funding after approval is a difficult task after approval by parliamentary public finance committee.
4.4.3.6 Conformity to project budget (bill of quantities, inclusion of M&E budget).

Other involvements during project implication should be evaluated carefully before carrying then out, otherwise could delay the implementation of the project. Eighty seven point one (87.1%) noted that budget should reflect all aspects of the project for example monitoring and evaluation should be included in the budget. M&E budget should be reflected whether it was internal or external. If logical frame work matrix was in place, it will be used as a guide and that could influence the completion of the project. PMCs expressed the need for allowances since most of them were leaders but without regular source of income and therefore such need should be reflected in the budget.

4.4.3.7 Adequacy of budget funds

Respondents were fully informed about the importance of adequate funding since the consequences are clear. Fifty one point nine percent (51.9%) of the respondents rated adequacy of budget fund very high most of stalled projects is due to inadequacy funding. They cite corruption, political factors and mismanagement of funds as the main culprits. These had a bearing on the political environment which affects the funding level of CDF projects. Social economic state of the community could affect the input and performance of stakeholders.

4.4.3.8. Supportive funding from other sources other than CDF

Supportive funding from any other source other than CDF was found to be handy to reduce chances of stalling projects. Sixty one point one percent (61.1%) rated supportive funding of the project as very high. They felt that if funding was regular then projects could be completed on time. Therefore, supportive funding would be essential, however it was released that CDF management does not involve its programme with supportive sources.
4.4.3.9. Audit reports

Auditing was normally done by ministry of works, at times by CDF management, at times MP personal assistance carried out an audit of a project and a report to the findings to the MP parliamentary public finance committee also involve audit firms to audit. Eighty eight point eight percent (88.8%) rated audit as high and very high. It was from audit reports that stakeholders could make fundamental adjustments and decisions. Most of the respondents noted that audit is important for accountability. It emerged that most of respondents would prefer receiving audit reports so that they can take mitigating steps accordingly.

Key informants response on influence of budget on project completion was in line with committee members. All emphasized the need of receiving audit reports in order to take appropriate steps. Table 4.11 shows how KIIIs responded during scheduled interviews.

**Table 4.11: Influence of Budget on project completion frequencies and percentages respondents from (KIIIs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3.10 Hypothesis testing

**Table 4.12: Influenced of budget on project completion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual (d)</th>
<th>$d^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2_{10.4}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>6.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>2.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>5.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>345.96</td>
<td>33.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KIIIs emphasized that the budget was a key tool of monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects. They emphasized that budgeting should be done professionally under environment of reduced political influence.

Findings from KIIIs were used to test the influence using null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis as shown in Table 4.12.

4.4.3.10 Hypothesis results

Null hypothesis - Ho: adherence on the budget had no influence on project level completion.

Alternative hypothesis - Ha: adherence to the budget had influence on project level completion.

Chi-square test results to analyses the hypothesis

F = n-1 = 5-1=4

\[ X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E} = \sum \frac{d^2}{N} = \frac{70.56 + 29.16 + 54.76 + 6.76 + 345.98}{10.4 + 10.4 + 10.4 + 10.4 + 10.4} = 48.769 \]

Table value = 9.485 5% level

Calculated value = 48.769

The standard tables of \(X^2\) give value of 9.485 at 5% level with 4 degrees of freedom yet calculated value is 48.769 much higher than table value of 9.485.

Calculated value was much higher than table value hence highly significance reject Ho accept alternative hypothesis – Ha and that the budget had positive influence on project completion.

The results were consistent with Wabwire (2010), that this promotes transparency and accountability. CDF budgets and expenditure need to be discussed to the public to recognize their right to know how tax resources are spent. Wabwire (2010) further states increasing citizen participation in development programme is very objective for sustainability of CDF
projects. This in line with CDF act 2013 that has empowered CDF management to rank projects in order of priority in terms of short term and long term. The projects have to be communal in nature. The Local Authority Delivery Action Plan (LSWAP, 2000) was to introduce in order to enhance citizen participation in identifying their priorities and streamline the planning process in order to encourage the development of capital plans and enhance accountability.

Nyandemo (2010), observed that in order for the budget to be meaningful and viable. It should be consistent with long range plans of the project compatible and endorsed by executive management.

**4.4.4 Influence of stakeholder analysis on project completion.**

It was noted that Project committee members were the main stakeholders. Other stakeholders are the CDF office, and government through Ministries of Health, Education and Works. It was noted that they should work as a team to complete project in time. Committee members were interviewed about the influence of stakeholder analysis on project completion. They were given a scale ranging from very low to very high to select from according to how they rate the influence of stakeholder analysis to completion of the project. The frequency table 4.13 shows the significant influence of stakeholders’ analysis in project completion. The stakeholders would like to be empowered to M&E projects. The key informants support the view that the capacity building should be done as soon as possible for them to have the capacity to manage the projects.

Tables 4.13 and 4.14 show the responses from committee members and KIIIs respectively. The frequencies and percentages are analysed and discussed hereunder.
Table 4.13: Frequency and percentages – influence of stakeholder analysis to project completion response from committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Involvement</th>
<th>Very low F %</th>
<th>Low F %</th>
<th>Average F %</th>
<th>High F %</th>
<th>Very high F %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Stakeholders in Project Planning</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>13 24.1</td>
<td>36 66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Stakeholders in Project implementation</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>19 35.2</td>
<td>25 46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Monitoring &amp; Evaluation activities</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>18 33.3</td>
<td>30 55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor involvement as a Stakeholder</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>6 11.1</td>
<td>6 11.</td>
<td>16 29.6</td>
<td>21 38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Stakeholder analysis report</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>7 13.0</td>
<td>16 29.6</td>
<td>26 48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective intervention by Stakeholders</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>19 35.2</td>
<td>26 48.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses of committee members about influence of stakeholders are emphasized as indicated in Table 4.13 and this is corroborated by the responses by KIIs. Who also revealed stakeholders could have significance influence on project completion. The findings in Table 4.13 were analysed according to elements here under.

4.4.4 Involvement of Stakeholders in project planning

It emerged that involvement of stakeholders in the project plan cannot be underscored. They were the ones who came up with the ideas. Consequently they should play a role in formulations of the project plan. In that way, they can identify their priorities. They form the majority of PMCs. Others are representatives from CDF office, relevant Ministries and area MP. Due to the diversity of membership in the stakeholder committee it was imperative that a criterion for identifying them be objective so that it is representative enough. Overall most respondents scaled this as a very crucial component. Their involvement would directly influence time schedule for the completion of the projects. It was noted that PMCs would like as stakeholders be involved in project activity from planning stage, implementation up to completion.

4.4.4.1 Involvement of stakeholders in project implementation

It was understood that implementation was an active and practical stage of the project cycle where stakeholders should be involved in the project take off stage, witness its completion or stagnation of
the project. Eighty percent (80%) preferred very highly involvement in the project implementation however their role could be restricted in case of full contract project that is managed directly by CDF office. They Monitor and Evaluate the project during implementation. It emerged that stakeholders would like to participate at all stages of the contract project.

4.4.4.2 Involvement in M &E activities

It was understood that M&E was very important activity in the project life cycle. It could be used to make strategic adjustment or change of direction in the life cycle of a project. Eighty eight point nine (88.9%) percent preferred involvement of stakeholders in the M&E of projects. However, they preferred to be empowered with skills in order to play their respective roles so that they could influence completion of the project. They preferred going through capacity building through workshops and seminars. They emphasized the need of receiving M&E reports from parliament public finance committee and CDF management.

4.4.4.3 Contractor involvement as a stakeholder

It was emphasized that contractor cannot work in isolation he had to work with PMCs, Ministry of Works, Ministry of Health and CDF management. Sixty eight point five (68.5%) percent preferred high to very high involvement of the contractor it affects performance directly and completion of the project. It was noted that sharing ideas between contractor and PMC could influence completion because ideas will be in harmony. In their view it was an opportunity for PMC to advice the contractor about the quality of work.

4.4.4.4 Application of stakeholder analysis report

It was revealed that stakeholders were expected to carry out an analysis of the project implementation and prepare a report. The report should be copied to relevant institutions. Seventy seven point seven (77.7%) percent preferred high to very high preference for stakeholder analysis stakeholders reports they could influence the completion of the project. This was because they were the ones on ground and their observations are likely to be precise
and reliable. Furthermore, they were the beneficiaries of the intended outcomes. They could alert CDF management if there was any wrong doing during implementation of the project. It came out clearly that PMC world like to play a strategic role as being key stakeholders.

4.4.4.5 Corrective intervention by stakeholders

It emerged that stakeholders expect to participate in all stages of project life cycle and be capable of intervening in any matter pertaining the project. Eighty three percent (83%) preferred the intervention by the stakeholder because they could save a situation in time so that the project can be implemented without interruption. Thus the stalling of projects could be reduced enormously.

Key informants participated in scheduled interviews and gave their views under conducive environment. The findings from their responses are summarized in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14: Stakeholder analysis influence in project completion respondents from KII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from KIIs were in conformity with findings from committee members. They were all in agreement that stakeholders could influence project completion. It was consisted with the findings about strategic plan, logical framework and budget.

4.4.4.6 Hypothesis testing

Key informants participated during scheduled interviews and the findings were used for chi-square test in Table 4.15.
Respondents from KIIIs were used to test hypotheses in order to determine how the stakeholder analysis influenced the project completion. Findings are summarized in Table 4.15 and discussed hereunder.

Null hypothesis - Ho: Stakeholder’s analysis had no influence on project level completion

Alternatively hypothesis - Ha: stakeholder analysis had influence on project level completion.

Chi-square test was used results to analyse the hypothesis

Table 4.15: Stakeholder analysis chi-square test ($X^2$) from KIIIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>$d^2$</th>
<th>$d^2/104$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>8.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>5.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>8.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>43.56</td>
<td>4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>384.16</td>
<td>36.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.383</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = n-1 = 5-1$ where $F$ is degree of freedom

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O^i - E^i)^2}{E^i} = \sum \frac{d^2}{N} = \frac{88.36}{10.4} + \frac{54.76}{10.4} + \frac{88.36}{10.4} + \frac{43.56}{10.4} + \frac{384.16}{10.4}$$

$$= 63.383$$

Table value 9.488 5% level calculated value 63.383

Calculated value was much higher than table value hence highly significant

It is noted that standard $X^2$ table give 9.488 at 5% level at 4 degrees of freedom get the calculated value is 63.383 much higher from the table value.

Reject Ho accept Ha thus stakeholder analysis had influence on project completion.

The findings would add value on the mission of the Kenya Vision 2030 which is Kenya’s long term blue print which aims to create globally comparative and prosperous country providing a high quality of life for all its citizens. National integrated monitoring and
evaluation (NIMES) was established to track progress in implementation of the vision 2030 that emphasizes participation of citizens in development through community projects.

In addition, these findings were consistent with those of Kariuki (2011) which recommended the need to adhere to structured leadership selection criteria based on academic qualifications, ‘leaders’ skills, adherence to stipulated process of selecting committee members, and involvement local people in CDF management. In the same vein Chambers, (1993) expressed that new approach calls for a paradigm shift from conventional approaches to extensions nature imparting technical skills and knowledge to local people. And there involvement of stakeholders cannot be taken on the face value.

4.5 Project completion level analysis

The level of completion of projects in relation to the utilization of M&E tool was determined. Respondents gave estimation of projects completion level depending on what they expect and work done. For example health facilities estimated completion level to be 50% because the majority lacked maternity services. Table 4.4 shows clearly the estimated time, budget, percentage level of completion and reasons for non-completion
Table 4.16: Completion level of sampled CDF projects in the county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampled Constituency / Projects</th>
<th>Budget Kshs</th>
<th>Expected time for completion</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Reasons for non-completion/completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAVAKHOLO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namirama Girls secondary School. computer center</td>
<td>28m</td>
<td>2008-2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of adherence to strategic plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebuyusi high school. resource centre</td>
<td>18m</td>
<td>2008-2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lack of adherence to strategic plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingotse high school. Library</td>
<td>29m</td>
<td>2008 – 2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of adherence to strategic plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinoyi high school. Multipurpose/ dining hall</td>
<td>21m</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lack of adherence to strategic plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ematia health dispensary</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Lack of logical framework and stakeholder input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LURAMBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim secondary School. twin lab</td>
<td>31m</td>
<td>2012-2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of adherence to strategic plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikonyero secondary school. tuition block</td>
<td>18m</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emukaba AP camp</td>
<td>1.6m</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office, lack of logical framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakali health dispensary</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Lack of logical framework and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejinja corner AP camp</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Lack of logical framework, lack of stakeholder input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTERE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchenya Gils school. classrooms</td>
<td>1.9m</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchenya water project</td>
<td>6.4m</td>
<td>2004-2013</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office, lack of logical framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butere polytechnic</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shitsitswi health dispensary</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shisaba health dispensary</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
<td>2007-2010</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukhakunga secondary. classrooms</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Full contract awarded by CDF office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emuyuке health dispensary</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Lack of adherence in logical frame work and budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muting’ong’o health dispensary</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lack of adherence in logical frame work and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embiakalo health dispensary</td>
<td>11m</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lack of adherence in logical frame work and budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows projects’ percentage completion level by the time of this study. It also shows estimated budgets in millions of Kenya shillings and estimated time for completion.
There were indications that they are at different levels of completions due to various reasons. For example most the health projects were operational and yet not to the satisfaction of stakeholders. This was because in most cases it was realized much later that a maternity facility should have been included in the budgetary estimates. This was attributable to the; lack of logical frame that should have availed a practical analysis of the project. It is attributable to failure to include it in the budgetary estimates. Again it raises issues as to whether the stake holders were indeed involved. If they were, they should have come out very clearly with the needs of the community such as additional maternity facility. All these contributed to the low rates completion.

Regarding the uncompleted school projects, lack of adherence to the strategic plan and budget estimates seem to have been the cause. Here, it was observed that projects took a long time beyond the projected time line. The longer they took, the more expensive they became. For example at Ingotse high school, (Plate E5) and Muslim secondary (Plate E2), those in charge did not even speculate as to when these projects would be completed. Often, commencement and continuation of work took effect for as long as there was funding, and political goodwill.

The third category of project comprised what the respondents referred to as the contract projects. These included those at Bukhakunga high school in Malava constituency (Plate E1) and Shitsitswi (Plate E4). These were projects directly managed by respective CDF management. Most of them were at the level of more than 50%-100% completion. The respondents indicated that such projects were assured of constant funding and hence the high level of completion.

From Table 4.4, it was indicative that there was strong relationship between the M&E tools and project completion. All the tools were accorded a significant positive response clearly showing that all the four tools had significant influence on project completion.
It was revealed the budget for computer project facility at Namirama Girls High School in Navakholo constituency did not include very important components, that is electrical installation, toilets, plumbing, sewage system including septic tank and therefore the 28 million budgets had to be reviewed upwards. If the funding continues at an annual rate of 1.5m the project would take not less than 15 years to complete. This was because a logical frame work that will have analysed all aspects well was not worked and adhered to, therefore, the ground floor since 2007/2008 financial has yet to be completed. And therefore influence of the four tools of M&E that is strategic plan logical framework budget and stakeholders cannot be taken lightly, during the implementation of any CDF project in Kakamega county.
CHAPTER FIVE:
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introductions

This chapter summarizes the findings, conclusions and recommendations on influence of monitoring and evaluation tools on completion of CDF projects in Kakamega County.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the components of M&E tools and their influence on completion of CDF projects.

5.0.1. Hypotheses

In order to answer the research questions, the study tested for the following hypothesis

1. Null hypothesis- Ho: The application of strategic plan had no influence on the level of project completion.
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: application of strategic plan had influence on the level of project completion.

2 Null hypothesis - Ho: application of logical frame work had no influence on the level of project completion.
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: application of logical frame work had influence on the level of project completion.

3 Null hypothesis - Ho: adherence on the budget had no influence on the level of project completion.
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: adherence to the budget has influence on project level completion.

4 Null hypothesis - Ho: stakeholders analysis had no influence on the level of project completion
   Alternative hypothesis - Ha: stakeholder analysis had influence on the level of project completion.
5.1 Summary of findings

The study sought to examine the influence of M&E tools on CDF projects completion. The study was guided by the following themes:- influence of strategic plan on project completion, influence of logical frame work on project completion, influence of budget on projection completion and influence of stakeholders analysis on project completion in the entire Kakamega county, Kenya.

Based on findings the research came up with the followings summary and arrived at recommendations. That is funding should be regular. Politicians and specifically MPS should reduce their role in the implementation of CDF project. M&E should be part of strategic plan. PMCs should be involved in the formulation and implementation of logical framework that is essential before preparing a strategic plan.

5.1.1. Strategic plan

It emerged that strategic plan had significant influence on project completion. Respondents expressed that good strategic plan should be worked out and applied during project implementation and completion. Formulation of strategic plan should be spearheaded by the stake holders. There was need for incorporation of M & E in the strategic plan; it should be formulated from logical framework that has been worked out in advance.

5.1.2. Logical framework

It agreed that Logical frame work had significant influence on project completion. The PMCs should be involved during its formulation in an analytical and practical approach and should therefore be worked out in a well-planned work-shop to achieve the immediate goal. It should be worked out by empowered PMCs prior to the formulation of strategic plan.

5.1.3. Budget

It was noted that a well worked out Budget could result into early completion of the project. The budget should not be matter of bill of quantities. It should reflect other costs precisely, it
should include sustainability after completion of the project. It should not serve self-interest of anybody. Once approved by the parliamentary public finance committee, the funds should be released as reflected in the time lines, PMC should be transparent and accountable. PMC should receive audit reports, monitoring and evaluation results from Ministry of Works, Parliamentary Public Finance Committee and CDF Management respectively.

5.1.4. Stakeholder analysis

It was realized that a well-balanced stakeholder analysis would influence early completion of the project. Composition of stakeholders is crucial, because it affected their performance in PMC especially education level. At least form four, preferably with passion, they should be involved in the entire process of project planning, implementation and completion. They should be democratically elected without the influence of the MP.

The key stakeholder include CDF management office, PMC, Ministry of Works and Health. They should be well coordinated for the project to be completed within time lines.

5.1.5. Sustainability

CDF should consider sustainability of the project for example salaried staffs. Need for allowances and subsistence to PMC that may not be having any income at all.

5.2 Conclusions

It was observed that strategic plan should be properly formulated and adhered to. M&E should be part of strategic plan; the budget should be clearly defined in the strategic plan. Strategic plan should have clear defined timelines that reflects the funding consistency, CDF management should be involved in formulation of Strategic plan and abide by it.

It was preferred that logical frame should be formulated in workshop where by Stakeholders should play their roles. It should be worked out prior to formulation of strategic plan. It should reflect realities in terms of goals, inputs, outcomes and timelines of the project.
It was emphasized that budget should be realistic and address actual needs. It should reflect all the components of the expected outcomes for example laboratory should include electrical installations, plumbing, sewage system and other important facilities. It should be free from external influence for example political interference.

It was preferred that stakeholders should have at least form four level education and their roles must be clearly defined. In details, consider the interest of; the community and relevant institution. That should be in harmony with the government development policy.

5.3 Recommendations and suggestions for further research

The study established that those charged with the responsibility of carrying out M&E, comprising officials from CDF management and Ministries were not empowered with appropriate skills and knowledge, consequently it is recommended that they should be appropriately empowered with the necessary knowledge in order to have the grasp of how these tools in order to utilize them.

It is recommended that CDF management staff should include a quantity surveyor and monitoring and evaluation professional in order to carry out a credible M&E exercise of CDF projects. It was noted that many projects had stalled due to inconsistency in funding and change of political leadership. This study recommence that parliamentary public finance committee and CDF management should ensure that projects that are ongoing be completed before starting new ones. This is in spite of changes in political leadership.

It was established that the M&E tools have influence on project completion. Therefore it is important that further research be undertaken to put in place a framework that would ensure that there are mandatory components of project strategic plan and implementation process. Clearly defined.
A majority of the respondent did not comprehend what a logical framework is on being taken through the interview. It was established that a number of PMCs address aspects of logical framework without knowing what they are. Therefore there is need for further research to determine process and components of logical framework and how they influence project implementation.

It was noted that CDF does not consider aspects of sustainability such as salaries, allowances, maintenance and complementary utilities. For example if it is a health facility, where should the medication be sourced from? Further research should therefore be undertaken to establish how these projects can be budgeted for sustainability. CDF funds were in most cases for project implementation up to completion. It is up to the community or institution to sustain the operationalization the project. Often the community or institutions may not have the capacity to sustain the project. Therefore there is need for further research to determine how the stakeholder analysis can be applied to sustain the operationalization of the project.
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Appendix A: Letter to respondents

Ramadhan Barasa
P.O. BOX 2003
Kakamega
Date: ……………..

Dear Respondent

**REF: REQUEST TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH**

I am a post graduate student of university of Nairobi pursuing a programme leading to Master of Arts degree in project planning and management. As part of the course I am expected to conduct a research on influence of monitoring and evaluation tools on project completion.

This is to request you to participate in the exercise as a respondent.

The information provided for this research will be purely for academic purposes and the recommendation made will be important to your project and the country as a whole. The information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Yours faithfully

Ramadhan Barasa
Appendix B: Checklist

The researcher will analyse documents for evidence of the following

1- Available  
2- Not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project stages</th>
<th>Check list</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In puts</td>
<td>Site plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Project plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Logical framework (indicators of goals, inputs, outputs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes &amp; activities).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Logical framework matrix,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Gantt chart, (time schedule vs stages of implementation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of management chart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Time schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Stakeholders analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendering process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill of quantities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contracting process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out put</td>
<td>Completion Time schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence to operation schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stakeholders involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk of works services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of project tender committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Operationalization of the Completed Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability of the completed project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future development plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Est. budget</th>
<th>Adjustment budget</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Starting date</th>
<th>Expected finishing date</th>
<th>Expected output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
QUESTIONNAIRES

Appendix C: Questionnaire for committee members of the projects and the stakeholders

Section I

Kindly tick (✓)

Background information

1. Name ____________________________ (Optional) Tel. __________________ (Optional)
2. Gender: Male □ Female □
3. Level of Education

Please indicate the highest level of education you have attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>A level</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>Any other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. General Information

Name of constituency …………………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project description / type e.g. dormitory, health clinic, offices.</th>
<th>Approximate cost for the Project</th>
<th>Location of the Project</th>
<th>Designation of the respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section 2

(i) **Strategic Plan influence on Project Completion.**

By ticking in the space provided indicate the extent to which you feel the following aspects of CDF project implementation influence your respective Project Completion.

5 – Very high  4 – high  3 - Not sure  2 - Low  1 - Very low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Budget in the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the time schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation in Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to Project management chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders analysis – report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor requirement and conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of Project Completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Project Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation reports in relation to Project Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factors specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) **Stakeholders influence on Project Completion.**

By ticking in the space provided indicate the extent to which you feel the following aspects of CDF project implementation influence your respective Project Completion.

5 – Very high  4 – high  3 - Not sure  2 - Low  1 - Very low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Stakeholders in Project Planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Stakeholders in Project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Monitoring &amp; Evaluation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor involvement as a Stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Stakeholder analysis report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective intervention by Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factors specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) Logical Framework influence Project Completion.

By ticking in the space provide indicate the extent to which you feel the following aspects of CDF project implementation influence your respective Project Completion.

5 – Very high    4 – high    3 - Not sure    2 - Low    1 - Very low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of application of Logical Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical framework as a Projection of Project implementation and Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of input in the Logical Framework e.g. material, labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of the expected output or the Logical Framework. E.g. clinic will be for treatment of patients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of time schedule of Project outcomes e.g. science laboratory will be a good results in science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of activities in the Logical Framework e.g. contraction, procurement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Logical Framework Matrix in relation to strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations in relation to Logical Framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factors specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) **Budget influence Project Completion.**

By ticking in the space provide indicate the extent to which you feel the following aspects of CDF Project implementation influence your respective Project Completion.

5 – Very high      4 – high      3 - Not sure      2 - Low      1 - Very low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity of budget to Project Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely flow of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of adjustment of Project Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Budget during Project implementation services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual expenditure in relation to bill of quantities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of contingencies in the Budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to project Budget e.g. bill of quantity, inclusion of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of budget funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive funding from other sources other than CDF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factors specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPEN ENDED QUESTION**

1. In line with your responses above, how would you describe the Completion status of your Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10% Completed</th>
<th>50% Completed</th>
<th>50-100% Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. What are your views about influence of Monitoring and Evaluation tools on project completion? Suggest ways of improving CDF funding

   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
Appendix D: Interview schedule for Heads Institutions, Ministries / Department(s) of Education, Works, Health, Audit and local leaders from constituencies.

Background information

1. Name __________________________ (Optional) Tel. __________________ (Optional)

2. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

3. Name of Institution/Ministry / Department …………………………………………………

4. Level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>A level</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>Any other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 General Information

Name of constituency …………………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project description / type e.g. dormitory, health clinic, offices.</th>
<th>Approximate cost for the Project</th>
<th>Location of the Project</th>
<th>Designation of the respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

By ticking in the space provide indicate the extent to which you feel the following aspects of CDF Project implementation influence your respective Project Completion.

1. In your opinion how do you rate extent of utilization of the following Monitoring & Evaluation tools in project implementation?
2. 5 – Very high 4 – high 3 - Not sure 2 - Low 1 - Very low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Logical Framework (evidence of goals inputs (material) outputs e.g. health and activities).</th>
<th>Stakeholder analysis</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Approximate the extent to which completion level of a project has been influenced by the Monitoring and Evaluation tools indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Framework (evidence of goals inputs (material) outputs e.g. health and activities).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How do you rate the management of CDF Projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General questions during scheduled interviews**

5. What do you think about the influence of applying Monitoring &Evaluation tools on project implementation and completion?

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

6. What are your fears about management of CDF Project funding?

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

7. What are the challenges during project implementation and completion

.................................................................
.................................................................

8. Propose ways of enabling CDF projects to be completed in time.

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
Appendix E: Plates

Plate E 1: The Researcher at a Completed CDF project in Malava Constituency (Bukhakunga high school)
Estimated time 2008 – 2009
Estimated budget – Ksh. 1.4m

Plate E 2: An ongoing CDF project in Muslim Secondary School, Lurambi Constituency
Estimated time 2012 – 2013
Estimated budget – Ksh. 31m
Plate E 3: AP camp (Emukaba) in Lurambi constituency

Estimated time 2011 – 2012

Estimated budget – Ksh. 1.6m

Plate E4: Complete project Shitsitswi health centre Butere Constituency

Estimated time 2008 – 2009

Estimated budget – Ksh. 4.5m
Plate E5: Ongoing project Lab/Tuition Ingotse high school Navakholo Constituency

Estimated time 2008 - 2013

Estimated budget - Ksh. 29m

Plate E6 – ongoing CDF Project Computer Lab at Namirama Girls High School Navakholo Constituency.

Estimated time 2008-2013.

Estimated budget Ksh. 28m
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