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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Kenya. (A case of Langata Sub County). The objectives of the study were: to determine how human resource influence implementation of M&E of school feeding program in Langata sub county; to assess how financial management influence implementation of M&E of SFP in Langata sub county; to establish how stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of M&E of SFP in Langata sub county; and to examine how donors’ partnership influence implementation of M&E of SFP in Langata sub county. The study was guided by Theory of change by Fredrick Perls (2005). The study adopted a descriptive survey design in examining factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County. The target population of this study was 171 employees from monitoring and evaluation department from the 7 organizations providing school feeding programs in Langata sub-county and 18 school administrators that are benefiting from the program. A sample size of 120 respondents out of 171 employees were picked using simple stratified random sampling technique based on employees from M&E department. The data for the study was collected using a questionnaire and interview schedule. Quantitative analysis employed descriptive statistics with the help of Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings of the study may be used by the government in formulation of policies pertaining to School Feeding Program and improve monitoring and evaluation. The study found that human resource plays an important role in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County since trained and knowledgeable organizational and school staff ensure quality M&E results. It was evident from the study findings that proper financial management should guarantee efficient allocation of resources required for M&E and beneficiaries’ satisfaction in terms of quality service delivery. The study also found that active participation of all stakeholders in implementation of monitoring and evaluation is equally necessary for success and sustainability of the program and that donors’ partnership enhances implementation of monitoring and evaluation through funding and drawing more resources to assist in implementation. The study recommends that monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program be strengthened in schools by establishing a well facilitated M&E department, encouraging all stakeholders’ participation in monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program particularly ensuring that beneficiaries can participate effectively in monitoring and evaluating projects and adopting a modern information and communication systems in carrying out monitoring and evaluations. The areas that need further research include establishing challenges facing monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program, influence of information technology systems on monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program and determining how to strengthen primary stakeholders’ participation in M&E.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
Monitoring and Evaluation is a procedure of knowledge generation, self-assessment, and joint action in which stakeholders in a program collaboratively define the evaluation issues, collect and analyze data, and take action as a result of what they learn through this process (Jackson & Kassam, 1998). It is primarily based on allocating knowledge among beneficiaries of the funders, program implementers, program, and often outside evaluation practitioners. Monitoring calls for on-going certification of the specifics of program implementation so that outcomes can be enlightened in light of program processes. Assessing calls for rulings about the effectiveness and sustainability of the program (Byrne, 2005).

There is a growing interest within the international aid community in participatory approaches to M & E globally. It has been established that the contribution of stakeholders through M&E enhances the excellence of projects and improves the sense of national and local ownership in them, while instantaneously assisting to address local development needs (Nabris and Khalid, 2002). There is a greater possibility that the project activities and their impacts will be maintainable. Stakeholder participation in M & E can reinforce teamwork and partnerships at all stages and junctures of project implementation (Nabris and Khalid, 2002).

Evaluating a United States Federal programme in the USA, 'citizen learning teams' have played a role in checking and assessing a large government programme for community renaissance of distressed areas. Operating with local volunteers selected with goals to track, researchers, decided how to measure progress, and provided constant feedback to local leaders and government funding agencies (Scott, 2008). M&E intensified Funding to indigenous governance in Colombia in donor funded projects as well as state funded projects. The Association of Indigenous Councils of Northern Cauca (ACIN), plays a role in monitoring and evaluating its own multi sectorial regional growth plan (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998). They are looking at links between environmental, productivity and cultural factors, following changes over time and associating plans with results in a systematic way. This has assisted communities to recognize
their strengths, weaknesses and enhance their management competences, which, in turn, is leading to changes in power relationships.

According to Ghana National Development Planning Commission (2005), Ghana has pursued to grow a combined planning, policy, budgeting and M&E system to improve M&E in regard to school feeding program. The government seeks to use the outcomes obtained through the M&E system to advance resource allocation and assist in the formulation of future national development plans, including sector and district plans involved in school feeding program. The Ministry of finance uses M&E tools in its bungle of ministries, departments to certify that financial distributions are used to fund activities that lead to the understanding of sectoral targets (NDPC 2006). Efforts have been made to integrate Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) with the policy formulation and implementation processes in Ghana. The Annual Progress Reports system (APR) is planned to inform sector policy and programme design as well as budget allocations.

The School feeding program in Uganda is unified into the government. According to Schacter, (2000) the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) is the M&E lead agency in Uganda, and hence in charge of the coordination of the M&E systems in the country, which can sketchily be categorized into two, private and public. The public M&E system includes ministries and departments that run their own M&E such as Uganda Bureau of statistics (UBOS) and NPA. Despite the possible contribution of civil society to better M&E in Uganda, the linkage between the private (civil society) and the public M&E systems does not appear to be institutionalized (Segone, 2008).

The school feeding program in Kenya is eminent in low income regions and they draw government support in administration, monitoring and evaluation. The school feeding program M&E in Kenya has demonstrated successes as well as challenges. Both have provided critical lessons for addressing Kenya’s M&E agenda of ensuring accountability, transparency, performance and results as envisaged in the Kenyan constitution 2010. Among the prominent areas with school feeding program in Kenya is Langata Sub-county in Nairobi County. The delivery and implementation of the school feeding program in Langata Sub-county has some challenges contributed by the M&E function of the organizations and other stakeholders running the program.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite the efforts to manage school feeding programs, studies undertaken have shown that there are management hitches that include but not limited to monitoring and evaluation. According to (Schelber, 2004), managers do not have the capacity to effectively monitor progress and evaluate projects. Muthoki (2005) noted that SFP management had deteriorated as the head teachers in charge were overwhelmed by both normal duties of school management and that of SFP. According to Dzeze and Goyal (2003), the quality of SFP needs urgent attention.

Project finance management has equally been a major concern that has led to poor execution of M&E activities. (World Bank 2004) noted that project finance and budgeting has led to poor sustainability of community based projects in Kenya mostly after the offset of implementation. This is evident in the ineffectiveness of the projects’ beneficiaries incapacitation to finance and carry out periodic evaluations and continuous monitoring and inability to finance capacity building on M&E(World Bank 2004). It has also been attributed to inability of the organizations providing school feeding programs’ activities to develop a monitoring and evaluation system.

Donors’ involvement in the programs’ activities has greatly limited Kenyan government’s role in direction and stewardship of School feeding programs. This has subjected the programs to often fluctuating, conditional, international support (Espejo, 2009). Though school feeding program has been in Kenya since its inception in 1980’s, the success of the program remain vulnerable to how effectively it’s managed within the given period of time. From its inception it has targeted Arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) and urban slums in large cities such as Nairobi and Mombasa (Espejo 2009). According to Oxfam (2009), almost half (43 percent) of the ‘total poor live in urban slums amounting to 4 million people; 60 percent of Nairobi’s population.

Langata Sub County is a home of the largest slum among other sub counties in Nairobi County. It is with the described situation that Langata sub county is selected as it has a mix of all socio-economic classes and therefore has children from low socio-economic class who are the target of School feeding Program. Although studies have been done on Monitoring and evaluation, it seems like no study focused on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School Feeding Program. Mwangi (2013) studied Factors influencing ineffective implementation of monitoring and evaluation in economic stimulus projects, Magondu (2013) Studied Factors influencing
implementation of monitoring and evaluation in HIV Research Projects while Otieno (2012) studied Impact of Monitoring and evaluation systems on sustainability of community based projects. This study therefore seeks to examine Factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School Feeding Programs by service providers in Kenya, a case of Langata Sub County.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Kenya, A case of Langata sub-county.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives;

   i. To determine how human resource influences implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county.

   ii. To assess how financial management influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county.

   iii. To establish how stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-County.

   iv. To examine how donors’ partnership influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-County.

1.5 Research Questions

The research questions included;

   i. How does human resource influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county?

   ii. To what extent does management of finance influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-County?

   iii. How does Stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-County?
iv. To what extent does donors’ partnership influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-County?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The School Feeding Program (SFP) staff and managers can benefit from the outcomes of this research by allowing them integrate procedures and pointers for monitoring and evaluation. Moreover they will learn practices, best process and methods that promote effective monitoring and evaluation.

The Government officials in several agencies accused with monitoring and evaluation may be resolute to develop, modify or design tools that may determine effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and impact of evaluation. Therefore, the findings of the study may be used by the government in formulation of policies pertaining to SFP and enhance monitoring and evaluation.

All the stakeholders such as parents, students, guardians, school administrators, and community partnerships in the management and governance of the program may be alerted on their roles in the management of the programs’ activities. This will pre-empty any clashes and differences related with the program. The results of the study may also be significant to the practitioners and academicians both in contributing to the current body of knowledge in the area of monitoring and evaluation on factors influencing implementation of school nourishing programs.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The officers in charge of monitoring and evaluation of SFP mainly carry out their roles in different schools away from the office. This led to some delay in the distribution and collection of questionnaires. The administrative processes related with attaining information from government institutions also posed some challenges. Additionally, non-commitment of some school heads and M&E officers to offer required information due to distress of fault finding gave rise to delays. The researcher booked advanced appointments and pledges of commitment were made on policy of confidentiality of responses in order to address these concerns. The study is inadequate in scope as only one Sub County out of nine sub counties in Nairobi County was studied. The time aspect and distance involved if one were to visit all of them would have made the cost of the study high and time consuming. As a result of this, only Langata Sub County was considered.
1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to Langata Sub County because it houses the largest urban slum in Kenya and a target for SFP hence offers an opportunity for a rich source of data and any necessary information. The study was confined to employees of the organizations carrying out school feeding programs in Langata sub-county and school administration that are benefiting from the program. The study was only concerned with factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county.

1.9 Basic Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that all the respondents would be honest and truthful when answering the questions. It was also assumed that the respondents would be objective and competent in answering questions.

1.10 Definition of Terms used in the Study

**Donors’ partnership** - Is the involvement and coordination of many organizations and sectors in the management of a program.

**Financial management** - Is the mobilization and allocation of funds to various activities of a program.

**Human resource** - Persons or employees who operate a function within an organization

**Implementation of M&E of SFP** - The act of carrying out or putting into practice an assessment of how a project co-sponsored by World Food Programme and the government of Kenya to provide food to targeted schools particularly ASAL and urban slums is performing in terms of service utilization, quality and impact against plans.
Stakeholder participation – the process by which an organization involves people who may be affected by the decisions it makes or can influence the implementation of its decisions.

1.11 Organization of the Study

The study is organized in five chapters. Chapter One provides details on the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, limitations, and delimitations, basic assumptions of the study and definition of terms used. Chapter Two offers a review of the relevant literature on factors influencing implementation of Monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs, theoretical and conceptual framework. Chapter Three covers research methodology that was applied to source, process and requisite data. Chapter Four covers data analysis, presentation and interpretation of the study findings. This is followed by Chapter Five which contains summary of findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations as well as further research. References and appendices are at the end.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the literature review on M&E in relation to school feeding programs. It mainly focuses on implementation of monitoring and evaluation and school feeding programs, human resource and implementation of M&E of school feeding programs, financial management and implementation of M&E of school feeding programs, stakeholders’ participation and implementation of M&E of school feeding programs, donors’ partnership and implementation of M&E of school feeding programs, Kenya government policy and implementation of monitoring and evaluation, theoretical and conceptual framework, summary and research gaps.

2.2 Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation and School Feeding Programs
Implementation planning defines the data to be collected and the method used for monitoring. Obtaining advice from experts in data collection during the planning process contributes to a robust and credible methodology. According to Kent (2011), Monitoring will inform other components of implementation such as risk management and it is important to factor in reviews as part of planning process to assess progress of implementation at critical milestones or in response to specific issues. As part of the planning process, there should be a clear definition of the objectives and outcomes of the policy that is being implemented. It is essential to determine what successful outcomes will look like and what evidence will be needed to demonstrate success. As this has planning implications, thinking needs to occur from the outset and ensure activities are fit-for-purpose (Kent, 2011). There is need for a clear purpose and demand for undertaking monitoring, review and evaluation of activities. Information produced from this process must be targeted for specific audiences and be incorporated into the governance arrangements in order to enhance transparency and accountability. According to (Scott 2008), activities that occur isolated from decision-making or commence after implementation is complete are of limited value to initiative participants.

M&E process should be integral components of the management cycle including project planning and design (Passia 2004). According to Gyorkos (2003), project planners should include M&E plan that include all activities, persons to carry out the activities, sufficient budget for activities and specifications of the use of M&E findings. The purpose of Monitoring and
evaluation is to analyze the reliability and sustainability of school feeding programs as a key development intervention targeting the increase of school enrollment rates and levels of malnutrition among children. As the international community focuses its work on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to eradicate extreme poverty, increase universal education, reduce child mortality, and promotes gender equality by 2015, the use of school feeding programs in developing nations is clearly a critical intervention that should be considered (De Hauwere, 2010).

According to World Food Programme (2009) in both developed and developing countries, school feeding programs have demonstrated ability to raise and sustain school enrollment rates, as well as combat malnutrition among low-income families. In the context of a developing country, the promise of a meal at school can be a powerful incentive for families to send their children to school, instead of keeping them at home to work. By increasing enrollment incentives in this way, developing countries set off a powerful chain reaction: increased enrollment leads to increased literacy and education rates, which in turn leads to increased economic sustainability and opportunity (Buhl, 2009).

World Food Programme (WFP), report focuses on recommendations within the development field as the expert in the implementation of school feeding programs, and uses an evaluation of WFP’s Country Program in Ghana to demonstrate the potential strengths and weaknesses of such programs. Kenya is among countries funded by WFP due to the fact that its Country Program is in its last year of operation and is under consideration for a next phase of implementation. Kenya represents a unique insight into the African context generally: while it will become the first African country to obtain the first Millennium Development Goal (MDG 1) of reducing poverty by half, it is also a low-income, food deficit country with regional and rural-urban disparities (World Food Programme, 2009). To this end, the report analyzes the school feeding activities of the Country Program within the context of Ghanaian governmental, economic and agricultural capacities to provide recommendations on the general ideal conditions for the replicability and sustainability of WFP School Meals Programs in other African countries (De Hauwere, 2010)

The disparities in Kenya economy, agricultural productivity and uneven development between regions identified it as a candidate for a United Nations administered cooperative United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in 2006-2010. The UNDAF aimed to increase
human development and government capacity to provide basic services in Kenya. WFP's program design in Kenya, including methods, activities and expected outcomes relied on an integrated partnership approach that relied on building the capacity of the Kenyan government. While results of the program from 2006 to 2010 are identified as having met or exceeded its identified targets, particularly in terms of increasing gender parity in enrollment, the program has not sufficiently met its desired outcomes of widespread school feeding implementation and increased national capacity (De Hauwere, 2010).

2.3 Human Resource and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Programs

The technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in policy making process, and their motivation to impact decisions, can be huge determinants of how evaluation’s lessons are produced, communicated and perceived (Vanessa and Galla 2011). Human resources on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation befitting their expertise, if they are inadequate, the training for the requisite skills should be arranged. For projects with staff that are sent out in the field to carry out project activities on their own, there is need for constant and intensive on-site support to the outfield staff (Ramesh et al, 2002).

Evaluations should be carried out with relevant skills, sound methods, adequate resources and transparency in order to be quality (Jones et al, 2009). This implies that training of personnel largely determines effectiveness of M&E. Foresti, (2007) argues that this means not just training, but a whole suite of learning approaches from secondments to research institutes and opportunities to work on impact evaluations within the organization or elsewhere, to time spent by programme staff in evaluation departments and equally time spent by evaluators in the field. To be effective, the process of M&E need to have sufficient and capable staff with appropriate mix of skills and expertise, the motivation and will to act, incentives and resources necessary for their mandate. Kent (2011) suggests that the ability of an agency’s staff to meet demands for its services depends on both its numbers and the skills and expertise staffs bring to the job.

One of the larger aspects of developing employees’ skills is the organizational focus on employees to better either as a person or as a contributor to the organization. The attention coupled with increased expectations following opportunity can lead to self-fulfilling prophecy of
enhanced output of employees (Pearce and Robinson 2004). M&E systems require people to carry out information collection, data analysis, report preparation, sharing reflection and information dissemination so as M&E is designed there is need to understand who will work for the systems, what skills and knowledge they have and the overall human resources available both within the team and externally to support the system (Kent, 2011). The management and distribution of food requires trained people to keep track of food inventories and their location (Del Rosso and Marek 1996).

The school feeding M&E strategy is generally integrated within a national school feeding programme strategy. The development and implementation of the national M&E strategy is usually government-led and includes key stakeholders (ministry of education, school staff, community, national office of statistics) in the process (Carmen, 2011). The involvement of government agencies, such as the Ministry of Education and The Department of Statistics, is essential to ensuring M&E systems are aligned along national, regional and local levels. Consensus building around the M&E strategy is essential to align partners’ efforts within one integrated national system. A multi-stakeholder format also helps to ensure that adequate resources and capacities are allocated by all partners to the national M&E system (Kent, 2011).

2.4 Financial Management and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Programs

The project budget should provide a clear and adequate provision for M&E activities. A monitoring and evaluation budget can clearly be delineated within the overall project budget to give the M&E the due function it plays in project management (Gyorkos, 2003). According to Kelly and Magongo (2004) M&E budget should be about 5 to 10 percent of total budget. Project management and evaluation should be presented as an explicit part of overall mission and strategies. The project design should further set out the purpose and scope of project monitoring and evaluation process and establish the basis for effective participation by stakeholders (World Bank, 2004).

According to World Bank (2004), the budget for M&E process should include resources for the following activities, developing the M&E approach, capacity building, costs for implementation, community and discussion facilitator, information and feedback mechanism, internal learning documenting experience and provision for scaling up and institutionalization. Most resources for
M&E are required in the startup phase when the approach has to be designed and tested and facilitators have to be trained and coached (World Bank 2004). Budget limitations are constantly one of the greatest constraints to implementing monitoring and evaluation. While projects can often compensate for lack of technical capacity or outsourcing, they cannot compensate for lack of money. Carrying out monitoring and evaluation costs money and depending on how ambitious project implementers are about their M&E system, it can cost a lot of money. There are high costs associated with transportation, warehouse and distribution and adequate storage facilities are required at every stage. These costs are borne by recipient governments (Del Rosso and Marek 1996). Parent-teacher or other community associations can play a significant role in SFP and ultimately assume some of the costs. Efforts to strengthen parent-teacher organizations and increase the links between communities and schools are highly recommended (Kent, 2011). Conducting M&E activities requires an organization to invest valuable resources including money and people’s time. At least a rough budget for the activity is therefore needed as part of upfront planning (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998).

SFPs, by virtue of the fact that they include food, are expensive. Beyond the costs of the food itself, the costs associated with food management, logistics and control can represent a significant financial burden for governments. On-site feeding is costly as it requires daily preparation and delivery of food, but is also a model that can invite, or require, community participation. In response to the difficulties of on-site feeding and a new focus on delivering an appropriately-timed (with regard to effecting improvements in learning capacity) and high quality, consistent ration, some countries are developing program models that include less costly commodities and more efficient systems for delivery to schools (Segone, 2008).

Programs that make good use of the education infrastructure for delivery and logistics will be most efficient. The very fact that SFPs do not require, for the most part, additional infrastructure means that they can be less costly than other types of feeding programs which distribute benefits to groups that are not in one location (Kent, 2011). Programs that finance expensive kitchen equipment and supplies or build new infrastructure/canteens, however, will significantly raise the costs and lower the relative cost-effectiveness of programs. Finding ways to minimize implementation problems, particularly food losses, either to spoilage, to the black market or leakage, will help to ensure the financial feasibility of programs (World Bank, 1991).
Some SFPs are intentionally designed as an income-transfer for families, especially those that are trying to help attract girls to schools; the benefit received by families from these programs must therefore surpass the costs of having their daughters away from home attending school (Omamo, 2006).

Food transfer programs cannot be considered ‘sustainable’ in the same way as, for example, a revolving credit program, which ultimately pays for itself. A continual input of resources is required in order to provide food for school children. From the donor point of view, a program may be seen as sustainable if the government commits to continuing the program (in similar or another form) after donor support is removed. From the perspective of the individual beneficiary, the sustainable aspect of the program is likely to be the lasting impact on behavior changes brought about through education or other interventions that are part of the program (Rogers, 1994).

2.5 Stakeholders’ Participation and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Programs

Engaging stakeholders in discussions about the what, how, and why, of program activities is often empowering for them and additionally, promotes inclusions and facilities meaningful participation by diverse stakeholder groups, (Donaldson, 2003). Stakeholder participation means empowering development beneficiaries in terms of resources and needs identification, planning on the use of resources and the actual implementation of development initiatives (Chambers, 1997).

School, parent and community partnerships have been described as the continuous planning, participation, and evaluation of activities that enhance the success of students (Indiana Department of Education, 2001). A number of people will be required for food acquisition (or growing/harvesting), meal planning, food preparation, and clean up, as well as project management and operation. Involvement of school staff, parents, students and community members will be required for a successful program. In many instances, parent volunteers operate school feeding programs. While keeping costs down, it has the added bonus of increasing community participation creating a sense of ownership of the project (Boston Consulting Group, 2009). Programs that involve parents, staff and students in the operation and management often have greater success; however care must be taken to ensure that abuses do not occur. There have
been instances where individuals have taken advantage of students (making them work in school gardens and selling the food for their own benefit) and have taken foodstuffs, equipment and materials for their own personal gain (Patton, 2010).

Time spent garnering support from key school and other community members early on will pay off in the long run when policies are passed and implemented. It is particularly important to have the school administrators engaged in the policy process. Their roles include; gaining staff support and commitment, allocating resources to support development and implementation of nutrition policies; and facilitate communication with families and community. The teachers also integrate nutrition into curriculum and subject areas such as technology, math, health, science, life skills and home economics, identify resources and serve as role models for children and encourage good nutrition practices (Buhl and Amanda, 2009).

The engagement of students in all aspects of the policy process, from development and adoption to evaluation, will help assure that policies are understood by students, and that their implementation is supported by students and other school community members. The students provide input about acceptable food options and nutrition-related activities and practices. They serve as role models for peers and as liaison between school district wellness team and other students. (Espejo, 2009). Families are busy, and parents often feel stretched for time. Involving parents and guardians is very vital and this can be achieved by starting to educate them about the importance of nutrition and fitness, as it relates to the success of their students, and the desire of the school to support parent and student efforts. Developing a guide to engage parents in local school wellness policy provides resources and tools that will help school stakeholders engage parents in local school wellness policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation (Buttenheim, et al., 2011).

2.6 Donors’ Partnership and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Programs

Global partnership in SFPs covers a broad range of sectors such as education, health, agriculture and various dimensions of management including implementation, procurement mechanism, financial, monitoring and evaluation in the programme. According to Scopetta (2002), when partners are trained to use evaluation tools and help develop a monitoring process involving external specialists, their training helps into a wider process that continuously measures
performance. The use of an external evaluator combined with partnership’s involvement in the procedure shall ensure demonstrable results. Moreover, continuous and internal auditing will help partners maintain reliability and credibility among members. In order to fully appreciate the direction taken by partnership and its results, it is important to establish the initial baseline situation and compile key data regularly and on an on-going basis (Scopetta, 2002).

Associated in the past with unsustainable models of food aid, SFPs have in recent times been embedded into the institutional and legal frameworks of implementing countries and have further been linked with local food sources (Levinger, 1986). Today, school feeding is seen as a safety net that contributes to countries’ social protection and development goals by providing support to children and their families in almost every country in the world. The strongest partnerships in SFP activities thus far have been between agencies under the United Nations (Education for All Global Report, 2012).

UNICEF offers assistance in teacher training, health intervention mechanisms, supply of books and curriculum development. UNESCO on the other hand offers technical assistance, program design and evaluation (Education for All Global Report, 2012). The WHO supports de-worming and other school health issues connected with the SFP. The WB focuses on the preparation of strategy papers aimed at poverty reduction, post-disaster reconstruction, school health and—potentially—work with HIV/AIDS orphans and prevention activities, and adolescent girls. The FAO offers support to countries implementing the HGSF programme, encourage the creation of school gardens and help design nutrition education programs (WFP, 2004, Kearney, 2008). For instance, a collaborative effort between the WFP, WB and UNICEF saw the development of the Systems Approach for Better Education Results tool for systematic policy analysis of school health and school feeding interventions in South Asia and about twenty countries in Africa (WFP, 2013).

Apart from UN agencies, the partnerships that exist among global NGO’s in SFPs such as Catholic Relief Services, Bill and Melinda Gates have contributed significantly to SFPs. Catholic Relief Services, has a very long and excellent history of work in food for education activities (WFP, 2004). Grants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to support the link between school feeding and local agricultural production, has been instrumental. This is evident in three impact evaluations, case studies and technical working papers and the provision of technical
assistance to countries, especially on the issues of monitoring and evaluation and the link to local agricultural production (WFP, 2013). Donor staff members in country offices face organizational challenges and tradeoffs. They have limited time and resources within M&E budget lines difficult to justify and protect. They work in partnership with local agencies and statistical bureau which often have limited capacity and resources and a fixed view of which monitoring methods are appropriate (OECD, 2010).

The Partnership for Child Development's HGSF initiative aims to support governments and other HGSF stakeholders by providing direct, evidence-based and context-specific support and expertise to improve the design and management of effective school feeding programs which use locally sourced food. Different operational support materials have been developed by PCD and its partners, and these also include guidelines and training materials, toolkits to support data collection and analysis, as well as data on HGSF programme on the ground (Morgan, 2007).

2.7 Kenya Government Policy Intervention and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School feeding programs

As in other service delivery programs the overall structure of public administration in the country is one key factor in determining the framework for the school feeding program and in assigning responsibilities at the different levels. It will determine issues like financial flows, responsibility levels and capacities. This means that an analysis of the governance structure in a country needs to be included in the initial steps of designing the program, which is lacking in the guidance, research pieces and tools available at the moment (Del Rosso, 1996).

Rather than there being different school feeding implementation models that countries can choose from, governments’ point of departure when putting together a school feeding program is the nature and shape of its overall governance system. Within that system different adjustments can be made in terms of how to best link the program to small-scale farmer production for example, or how to increase community participation (Carmen and Sidaner, 2011).

In Kenya, the Home Grown School Meals (HGSM) program implemented by the Ministry of Education first began in 2009 as part of a broader strategy to transition the WFP-supported school feeding program to government ownership and implementation (Carmen and Sidaner, 2011). The Ministry of Education and WFP had collaborated since 1980 to provide meals to
vulnerable and disadvantaged school children in unplanned urban settlements and the arid and semi-arid districts of Kenya through the Regular School Meals Program. In 2009, increased commodity and transport costs that resulted from the global food and fuel prices crisis forced WFP to reduce its support from 1.2 million to 770,500 beneficiaries (Carmen and Sidaner, 2011). Recognizing the importance of school meals, the government took the initial step to transition to a government funded and managed school meals program by committing to feeding the children previously benefiting from WFP support with a similar meal. The national program started within a few months to keep as short as possible the period during which the children would not receive the school lunch. However, the government moved to school based procurement from the beginning, in line with the existing decentralized procurement process for school supplies (Omamo, 2006).

2.8 Theoretical Framework

The study is based on the Theory of change (TOC) by Fredrick Perls (2005). Theory of change when applied to social change processes represents a thinking action alternative to other more rigid planning approaches and logics. A theory of change defines pieces and steps necessary to bring about a long term goal. It also describes the types of interventions that bring about results hoped to.

A theory of change includes assumptions (often supported by research) that stakeholders use to explain in the process of change (Rogers, 2008). According to the theory of Change, set of assumptions and abstract projections regarding how project members believe reality could be untold in the immediate future. Based on a realistic analysis of current context, a self-assessment about their capabilities of process facilitation and a crucial and explicit review of the study, assumptions of community involvement in monitoring and evaluation and a process that helps monitor consciously and critically individual and also collective way of thinking (Rogers, 2008). The theory of change describes how changes might occur; the point is not to predict change, but to understand how change may happen through community participation in monitoring and evaluation and how it could be influenced through intervention strategies.

The study found it most appropriate to adopt the theory of change because it is a conscious and visualization exercise that enables project stakeholders to focus energy on specific future realities which are not only desirable, but also possible and probable when addressing social and
community based issues like school feeding programs. Theory of change therefore serves as a basis for future planning M&E activities, as well as communication about such activities with partners and funders. The problem that the study seeks to examine and recommend on is supported by this theoretical examination in the sense of examining factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program through the research objectives stated.

2.9 The Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework depicts the relationship between the independent variables; human resource factors, financial management, stakeholders’ participation, donors’ partnership and dependent variable; implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program.
Independent Variables

Human Resource factors
- Training of school staff
- Managerial skills and expertise
- Knowledge in M&E
- Number of staff

Financial Management
- Budget allocations and pooled funding
- Financing capacity building
- Financing information and feedback mechanism
- Honorarium

Stakeholders’ participation
- School Administrators
- Students
- Parents and Guardians
- Community members

Donors’ partnership
- Operational support materials
- Technical assistance
- Direction and expertise on implementation design.

Intervening Variable

Government policies on M&E

Dependent Variable

Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of school feeding programs
- Frequency of M&E
- Utilization of M&E results

Fig. 1 Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework above shows how variables interact and affect each other indicating that independent variables such as human resource, financial management, stakeholders’ participation and donors’ partnership have a direct influence on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School feeding programs. The conceptual framework also suggests that government policies influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School feeding programs.

It is important to note that while other numerous variables such as information technology systems as well as school management policies influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program, this study will address itself to the factors already listed above.

### 2.10 Summary of the Literature Review

Monitoring and evaluation has been identified as a vital component of the management cycle if projects’ objectives and success is to be realized. For effective implementation of M&E, project planners need to include in the plan all activities, capable persons to carry out the activities, sufficient budget, and the extent of stakeholder engagement and specifications of the use of M&E findings. While many outside agencies can evaluate SFP, a few have the know-how and skills to employ M&E approaches and fewer still are able to design and implement effective M&E system (World Bank, 2004). Given the financial constraints and restrictions, numerous organizations in charge of SFP experience management related challenges including M&E of the program (World Bank, 2004).

### 2.11 Research Gap

There is need for a clear purpose and demand for undertaking monitoring, review and evaluation of activities. Information produced from this process must be targeted for specific audiences and be incorporated into the governance arrangements in order to enhance transparency and accountability. Though school feeding program has been in Kenya since its inception in 1980’s, the success of the program remain vulnerable to how effectively it’s managed within the given period of time. M&E process should be integral components of the management cycle including project planning and design. To be effective, the process of M&E need to have sufficient and capable staff with appropriate mix of skills and expertise, the motivation and will to act, incentives and resources necessary for their mandate. Although studies have been done on
Monitoring and evaluation, it seems like no study focused on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School Feeding Program. This study thus examines factors influencing implementation of M&E of School Feeding Programs by service providers in Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the overall methodology used in the study. This includes the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, pilot study validity of instruments, reliability of instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive survey design in examining factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County. Descriptive survey was found appropriate in collecting information about peoples’ attitudes, opinions, habits or the variety of education on social issues (Orodho and Kombo, 2003). Chandran (2004), says that descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current situation and other phenomena and wherever possible to draw valid conclusion from the facts discussed. This study intended to capture information on the current practices on SFP and recommend ways of improving the same.

The descriptive survey was used to establish association between variables at a given point in time without attempting to change their behavior or conditions (Kothari, 2004). This method was preferred because it allows for prudent comparison of the research findings. Descriptive survey attempts to describe or define a subject often by creating a profile of a group of problems, people or events through the collection of data and tabulation of the frequencies on research variables or their interaction as indicated.

3.3 Target Population
The target population of this study was 171 employees from monitoring and evaluation department from the 7 organizations providing school feeding programs in Langata sub-county (Population council, 2009) and 18 school administrators that are benefiting from the program. Target population in statistics is the specific population about which information is desired. According to Ngechu (2004), a population is a well-defined or set of people, services, elements, and events, group that are being investigated. Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003), explain that the
target population should have some observable characteristics, to which the researcher intends to generalize the results of the study. This definition ensures that population of interest is homogeneous (Mugenda, 1999).

3.4 Sampling Procedure and sample size
This section includes Sample size and Sampling Procedure of the study:

3.4.1 Sample Size
A sample size is a subset of the population to which researcher intends to generalize the results. Any statements made about the sample should also be true of the population (Orodho, 2002). A sample size of 120 respondents out of 171 employees were picked using simple stratified random sampling techniques based on organizations that provide SFP in Langata Sub County. This was deemed necessary because the technique gives all organizations a chance of being selected into the sample. The sample size per organization was arrived at as a proportion of the organizational population size in comparison with that of the other organizations.

The sample was obtained by calculating the sample size from the target population by applying Cooper and Schindler, (2003).

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

Where: \( n = \) Sample size, \( N = \) Population size, \( e = \) Level of Precision.

At 95% level of confidence and \( P=5 \)

\[
n = \frac{171}{1 + 171(0.05)^2}
\]

\( n = 120 \)
### 3.1: Summary of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents from listed service providers</th>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Food Program (WFP)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute For Development and Welfare Services (IDEWES)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed The Children (FTC)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action For Rural Development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Relief Service (CRS) School Feeding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2 Sampling Procedure

Sampling means selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population as a representative of that population. Sampling is the procedure a researcher uses to gather people, or things to study. It is a process of selecting a number of individuals or objects from a population such that the selected group contains elements representative of the characteristics found in the entire group (Orodho and Kombo, 2002).

The study employed both probability and non-probability sampling. The organizations exhibit varying characteristics as far as population of employees is concerned. Some have a high population and others have a low population. The study adopted stratified random sampling to ensure organizations in the population are represented in proportion to their numbers in the population. The probability of selecting each respondent was proportional to their population so that category with larger population had proportionally greater chance of being included in the sample. Simple random sampling was used in identifying employees to fill the questionnaire.

Purposive sampling method was also used in selecting schools where only schools that have SFP in Langata Sub County were included in the sample. This technique allowed the researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study (Mugenda, 2003).
3.5 Research Instruments

The data for this study was collected using a questionnaire and interview guide. The questionnaire contained closed ended items and Likert scale. The interview guide contained open ended questions useful in collecting in depth answers from respondents. Questionnaires were issued to the employees of the organizations implementing the SFP in Langata Sub County with the help of research assistants. The interview was conducted on school heads since they have key information on the factors influencing implementation of M&E of SFP in Langata Sub County.

3.5.1 Pilot Testing

Pilot testing allows the researcher to identify any difficulty with the materials and investigate the accuracy and appropriateness of the instrument developed. Pilot testing was an important step in testing questionnaire to ensure quality data is collected at the end of the study. The pilot study involved 10 respondents from Mathare division. The data collected from the pilot study was then analyzed using Cronbach’s alpha in order to obtain data that is consistent with the objectives of the study. Cronbach’s case is useful with attitude instruments that use Likert scale. SPSS is often used to calculate Cronbach (Del Siegle, 2002).

3.5.2 Validity of Research Instruments

Validity determines whether the research truly measures that which it is intended to measure or how truthful the research results are, Joppe (2009). Research instrument is valid if it measures what it is supposed to measure and when the data collected through it accurately represents the respondents’ opinion (Amin, 2005). This was ascertained by the supervisor and lecturers in the department.

3.5.3 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Reliability refers to consistency of measurement; the more reliable an instrument is, the more consistent the measure. (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). To enhance reliability of instruments, a pretest was done through administering questionnaire randomly to selected respondents in Mathare Division, the area has similar characteristic as the case under study. It was further enhanced by making necessary adjustments to the questionnaire based on
the pilot study. Reliability analysis was subsequently done using cronbach’s Alpha. Gliem and Gliem (2003) established Alpha value threshold at 0.7 thus forming study’s benchmark. Alpha was established for every objective which formed a scale as shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Summary of Reliability Coefficients for Variables of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Statements</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource and implementation of M&amp;E of SFP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management and implementation of M&amp;E of SFP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ participation and implementation of M&amp;E of SFP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors’ partnership and implementation of M&amp;E of SFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of SFP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human resource and implementation of M&E of SFP and implementation of monitoring and evaluation of SFP showed the highest levels of reliability at 0.891 and 0.835 respectively. Financial management showed a reliability of 0.831; Stakeholders’ participation 0.765; and donors’ partnership showed the lowest level of 0.761 which was above the 0.700 measure that is recommended as evidence that the measurement items have a high measure of internal consistency for underlying constructs of the questionnaire on examining factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. An alpha score of 0.70 or more indicate that the instrument is reliable. Data reliability played an important role towards enhancing generalization of gathered data to represent the true characteristics on factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county since it aided the researcher in clearing any ambiguities and ensuring that the questions posed measured what was intended. If the Cronbach’s alpha is high, the instrument is said to yield data that have high test reliability.
3.7 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher obtained an introduction letter from the University of Nairobi for the purpose of data collection. Once permission was granted from the schools and the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation, the researcher visited the area of study to make appointments with the respondents.

The data was collected using a self-administered questionnaire issued to the respondents by the researcher with the help of research assistants who had been trained on data collection and ethical considerations in research. Nevertheless, where it proved difficult for the respondents to complete the questionnaire immediately, the researcher left them with the research assistant to pick on a later date. In the course of piloting, the researcher visited the area and administered the instruments. The researcher conducted interview with the schools’ heads which gave insight on required information with respect to the objectives of the study on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of SFP.

3.8 Data Analysis Techniques

Analysis is the process of categorizing, ordering, manipulating and summarizing data to obtain answers from research questions. It is done to reduce data to intelligible and interpretable form using statistics. Data analysis refers to the process of examining what has been collected and making deductions and inferences out of it (Kombo and Tramp, 2006). It is the process of making meaning from the data. After the field work, the researcher edited and counter checked completion of questions in order to identify items which were not appropriately responded to. The completed questionnaires were edited for completeness and consistency, checked for errors and omissions. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics where responses from questionnaire were tallied and analyzed using frequency distribution, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. In order to save time and money, while increasing accuracy of the results, Computer statistical program for social sciences (SPSS) was used in processing data. The results were presented in tabulated form for easy interpretation. Interpretation refers to searching for meaning and implication of research instruments in order to make inferences and draw conclusions. Table represents research instruments more clearly and economically than text presentations (Kasomo, 2006). The data from interview schedule was sifted through, sorted into themes, categories and patterns. This further assisted in developing the narrative description.
3.9 Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in an ethical manner. The respondents were explained to the purpose of the study and they were assured that the information given would be treated as confidential and their names would not be divulged. Informed consent was sought from all the participants that agreed to participate. A research approval was also sought. The researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the respondents.

Their confidential information would only be accessed by the researcher and the supervisor. They were not required to provide any identifying details and as such, transcripts and the final report would not reflect the subjects identifying information such as their names. After the study has been completed and a final report written, the tools used to collect data were destroyed.
### 3.10 Operationalization of Variables

**Table 3.3: Operationalization of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Tools of Analysis</th>
<th>Measuremnt scale</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Type of data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine how human resource influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>Independent variable Human Resource</td>
<td>Training of school staff, Managerial skills and expertise, Knowledge in M&amp;E Number of staff.</td>
<td>Frequency Percentage Mean Standard deviation</td>
<td>Ordinal Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaires Interview guide</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess how financial management influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>Independent variable Financial management</td>
<td>Budget allocations and pooled funding, Capacity building, Honorarium, Information and feedback mechanism</td>
<td>Frequency Percentage Mean Standard deviation</td>
<td>Ordinal Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaires Interview guide</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish how Stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>Independent variable Stakeholders’ participation</td>
<td>School Administrators, Students, Parents and Guardians, Community members,</td>
<td>Frequency Percentage Mean Standard deviation</td>
<td>Ordinal Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaires Interview guide</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To examine how donors’ partnership influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs by service providers in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>Independent variable Donors ‘partnership’</td>
<td>Operational support materials, Technical assistance, Direction and expertise on implementation design</td>
<td>Frequency Percentage Mean Standard deviation</td>
<td>Ordinal Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaires Interview guide</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dependent variable                                                                 | | | | | | |
| Implement ation of Monitoring and Evaluation of school feeding programs | Frequency of M&E Utilization of M&E results | Mean Standard deviation | Ordinal Nominal | Questionnaires Interview guide | Qualitative and quantitative data |
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CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter provides an analysis, presentation and interpretation of data on factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata Sub County, Kenya.

4.2 Questionnaire Response
A total of 120 questionnaires were distributed and 103 were collected having been filled completely. This constituted a response rate of 103 (85.8%) which according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a response rate of more than 80% is sufficient for a study. The researcher interviewed the 18 targeted school heads.

4.3 Demographic Information
This section discusses the demographic characteristics of the respondents in the study. These include, distribution of respondents by their gender, age, level of education and experience in handling school feeding programs activities.

4.3.1 Distribution of Respondents by Gender
In this section the researcher sought to establish the gender of the respondents. Their responses are shown in Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender; the results show that 58(56.3%) of the respondents were males while 45(43.7%) of the respondents were females. This implies that there were more male respondents than females in the organizations carrying out monitoring and
evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. This however does not affect the results of the study.

4.3.2: Distribution of Respondents by their Age

The respondents were further asked to indicate their ages with the aim of establishing the age bracket. Table 4.2 shows the age distribution of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age bracket</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 39 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above 28(27.2%) of the respondents were less than 30 years of age, those of the age between 30 – 34 years were the majority with 37(35.9%), those between 35 – 39 years were 29(28.2%), and those with ages of between 40 – 44 years were 9(8.7%) and 2(1.9%) for those in the age of 45 years and above.

4.3.3 Distribution of Respondents by their Level of Education

The respondents were asked to indicate their academic background. Table 4.3 shows the study findings on the respondents’ academic background.
Table 4.6: Distribution of Respondents by their Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to establish the respondents’ level of education. Majority of the respondents 56(54.4%) had undergraduate degree, 29(28.2%) were diploma holders, and 15(14.6%) were masters degree holders and finally3 (2.9%) with PHD and none with KCSE.

4.3.4 Distribution of Respondents’ by Experience in Handling School Feeding Program Activities

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they have been interacting with school feeding program activities in Langata Sub County. This was expected to help the researcher know the kind of experience the respondents have and how effective they would be able to give information about the factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata Sub County, Kenya. The results are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Respondents’ by Experience in Handling School Feeding Program Activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.4, the result shows that majority 48 (46.6%) of the respondents have been handling school feeding program activities for between 5-10 years. 26 (25.2%) have been handling school feeding programs activities in Langata sub-county for 1-5 years, 14 (13.6%) have been handling school feeding programs activities in Langata for 11-15 years while 6 (5.8%) have been handling school feeding programs activities in Langata sub-county for over 15 years and 9 (8.7%) have had an experience of less than 1 year. From the study, majority of the respondents have been handling school feeding program activities for a considerable long period of time.

4.4 Human Resource and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

The researcher sought to address the first objective that looked at human resource factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The Table 4.5 shows the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The training of school staff on M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.9667</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The managerial skills and expertise in conducting M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff’s knowledge in M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>2.9667</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of staff in M&amp;E department influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.6333</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to indicate how human resource factors influences implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The results show that the majority of the respondents indicated that the training of school staff on M&E
influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a high extent with a mean of 3.9667, The managerial skills and expertise in conducting M&E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county county to a moderately high rate with a mean of 3.0, Staff’s knowledge in M&E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high rate with a mean of 2.9667 and the number of staff in M&E department influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a high extent with a mean of 3.6633. The respondents were further asked to express their view on how human resource influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. They argued that untrained staff will have a challenge in implementation of M&E thus poor results whereas trained and knowledgeable organizational and school staffs are key in ensuring quality M&E and implementation at all levels including quality feedback and information on program planning and design. Other factors mentioned included acquiring managerial skills necessary in training of staffs, improving schools visits, and securing funds to enable swift and efficient running of personnel.

Interviewees were asked their opinion on how human resource influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county which they agreed on a number of factors. Key among them is maintaining cordial relationship among stakeholders involved i.e. schools, students, organizations, parents and the entire community, availing the much needed funds for the projects’ activities and determining the success or failure of the process as they run all the day-to-day operations, improving skills and knowledge inhibited by the evaluator and monitors through training and mentorship programs for efficiency and effectiveness.

4.5 Financial Management and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

Respondents at this level of the study were asked to rate how financial management factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The Table 4.6 illustrates the research findings.
Table 4.9: Financial Management and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocations and pooled funding influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing capacity building has an influence on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and feedback mechanism influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>2.2667</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building cost influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>3.0333</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching cost influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>3.0667</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration of M&amp;E staff influences the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the respondents’ perspective, budget allocations and pooled funding influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent with a mean of 2.7. Financing capacity building influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent with a mean of 3.0, information and feedback mechanism influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a low extent rate of 2.2667, Capacity building cost influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent with a mean of 3.0333, Teaching cost influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county and Remuneration of M&E staff influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent with a mean of 3.0667.
Respondents were asked to air their views on how financial management influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county and they pointed out misappropriation of funds to unintended channels and poor remuneration as the main factors undermining financial management, accounting for food commodities thus ensuring adequate utilization of food and M&E resources, ensuring stakeholder and beneficiaries satisfaction in terms of quality service delivery and ensuring maximum output/results within available financial resources.

4.6 Stakeholders’ Participation and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program.

The researcher sought to address the objective that looked at stakeholders’ participation factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The Table 4.7 shows the results.

Table 4.10: Stakeholders’ Participation and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School administrators influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Students themselves influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents and guardians influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community members influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.0333</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought information from the respondents on stakeholders’ participation factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The study found out that majority of the respondents agreed to moderately high extent that school administrators influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs with a mean of 3.412. The parents and guardians influence
implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs to a moderately high rate with a mean of 3.2667. Students and community members influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent rate with a mean of 3.0. Respondents’ opinions were also sought at establishing how stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of M&E, they pointed out lack of support by stakeholders in raising funds required to reinforce and activate the program activities’ and lack of teamwork in carrying out M&E of school feeding programs in Langata sub county.

Interviewees pointed out that collaboration through M&E can strengthen a partnership as it invokes clarity about strategy and perspective and builds trust through the information sharing that it encompasses. It further contributes to improving the knowledge base and creating joint analysis that also gives meaning to the partnership. As experience and understanding of abilities and obligations are built, expectations of what each party can deliver can be clarified and become more realistic. This may, in turn, open possibilities for drawing on more resources to assist with implementation and thus increase the ability to respond to these at the local level. Usually there are multiple stakeholders involved in local development. Well-structured M&E systems may help communities and schools to develop partnerships with projects, office bearers and other stakeholders. M&E can also promote dialogue among stakeholders who are either not in (much) direct contact or have (had) adversarial relations.

4.7 Donors’ Partnership and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program.

Respondents at this level of the study were asked to rate how donors’ partnership factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The Table 4.8 illustrates the research findings.
Table 4.11: Donors’ Partnership and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor operational support materials on monitoring and evaluation have influence on M&amp;E of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors’ technical assistance influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors’ direction and expertise on M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs.</td>
<td>3.0667</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents as indicated by a mean of 2.9 agreed that donor operational support materials on monitoring and evaluation have influence on M&E of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county, this might be attributed to the fact that there is a large number of schools that require donor support, Donors’ technical assistance influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs and donors’ direction and expertise on M&E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs to a moderately high extent with a mean above 3.0. On opinions as to how donor operational support materials on monitoring and evaluation have influence on M&E of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county, respondents pointed out provision of essential materials to make the program activities’ running i.e. provision of food, increases capital base through funding and salaries to cooks.

Interviewees argued that operations of school feeding programs have been supported by bilateral donors, the Government of Kenya itself (in kind), and various private bodies (both non-profit international and local as well as for-profit). Government of Kenya has contributed locally produced maize in kind. The programme has diversity in terms of livelihood zones targeted; modalities of food assistance (in-school meals, porridge with Corn Soya Blend) and partners involved in aspects of implementation, though school feeding is always under ministry of Education supervision.
4.8 Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation and School Feeding Program

The researcher sought to address implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. The Table 4.9 shows the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of M&amp;E results necessitates implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of M&amp;E increases rate of implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td>2.9876</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to eliminate fraud cases necessitates implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for efficient M&amp;E process is essential for proper</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for effective M&amp;E process facilitates implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents agreed that utilization of M&E, Frequency of M&E, elimination of fraud cases, efficient M&E process and effective M&E process facilitates implementation of M&E to a moderately high extent with a mean between 2.9 and 3.3. When asked on factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation and school feeding programs, interviewees mentioned the need for active participation by the government authorities such as City Education department and Ministry of Education. They also mentioned that the school management and community at large lack commitment and cooperation in terms of availing the required and necessary information concerning M&E of the program. Other factors mentioned included, organizational goals and strategies, politics in the sub county, lack of continuous capacity building and low stakeholder interest and participation in M&E. Some of the challenges experienced in implementing monitoring and evaluation of School feeding program were identified as lack of support from some stakeholders, attitude and perception of some stakeholders about monitoring and evaluation, misconception that donors should be allowed to provide everything and high levels of poverty on parents side thus funds needed to support the programs’ activities aren’t forth coming, unclear M&E parameters and critical success factors, insecurity in slums hampering continuous M&E, lack of full support from the management, lack
of enough man-power, lack of proper training of staffs, corruption and embezzlement of fund among others. This extends the potential of M&E into issues that can seriously challenge the status quo in situations where power abuses occur. The interviewees recommended enhancement of better understanding about M&E of SFP and therefore, more realistic and appropriate plans and policies, programs be more put in line to enhance effectiveness and sustainability of interventions, timely adjustments to plans, schedules and/or budgets, following local feedback on bottlenecks as well as unanticipated negative impacts that need correcting; identification of possibilities for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of activities; reduced waste of resources and possibility for corruption, improving stakeholders’ participation at all levels, shifting perception from monitoring as ‘policing’ to monitoring as mutually beneficial and a better working environment as learning from mistakes eases performance fears. On ways of overcoming challenges, interviewees identified sensitization of parents on their roles, government of Kenya should provide some funds for the purchase of firewood and salaries payments for cooks, introducing and training staff and monitors on new technology e.g. online database, involving all stakeholders at the beginning, building stronger working relationship with like-minded partners and government officials, mobilizing local funds to reduce over reliance on donors, continuous training on M&E and adding more staffs to facilitate the ever increasing number of kids and educate all the stakeholders on their roles.

4.9 Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Results
The study also sought to establish how the results from Monitoring and Evaluation are utilized. The Table 4.10 provides the research findings.
Table 4.13: Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making regarding implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for additional financial resources in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance review in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>2.2667</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re designing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.0333</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program intervention in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the respondents’ perspective, decision making regarding implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county influence utilization of results to a moderately high extent with a mean of 2.7, advocating for additional financial resources, re-designing and program intervention in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county were all agreed with a response to a moderately high extent with a mean of 3.0 and performance review to a low extent with a mean of 2.2.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of the study findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations. It also makes suggestions for further research. The findings are summarized in line with the objectives of the study which was to examine factors influencing implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county, Kenya.

5.2 Summary of Findings
For the first objective that was to determine how human resource factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata sub county, the results showed that training of school staff on M&E, the managerial skills and expertise in conducting M&E, Staff’s knowledge and the number of staff in M&E department were found to influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent. We can therefore infer that human resource is vital in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School feeding programs.

For the second objective which was to assess how financial management influences implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata sub county, the results indicated that budget allocations and pooled funding, financing capacity building, teaching cost and remuneration influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county to a moderately high extent. We can therefore conclude that financial management has an influence on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of School feeding programs.

Regarding the third objective which was to establish how stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata sub county, the findings of the study showed that school administrators, students, parents or guardians and community members influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county. We can therefore infer that stakeholder participation plays a crucial part in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs. Lastly,
the fourth objective was to examine how donors’ partnership influences implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County. The study found out that donors’ operational support materials on monitoring and evaluation, donors’ technical assistance and donors’ direction and expertise on M&E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs to a moderately high extent. We can therefore infer that donors’ partnership has influence on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program.

5.3 Discussions of Findings

The following are the discussions in line with the objectives;

5.3.1 Human Resource and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

The study has established that human resource factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County. Kent (2001) argued that for monitoring and evaluation to be effective, the process need to have sufficient and capable staff with appropriate mix of skills, expertise, motivation to act and resources necessary for their mandate. Kent (2001) also suggested that the ability of an agency’s, staff to meet demands for its services depends on both its numbers, skills and expertise staffs bring to the job. The study also revealed that training of staff, managerial skills and expertise, knowledge and experience in M&E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County. This is in line with literature review where Ramesh (2002) argued that human resources on a project should be given job allocation and designation befitting their expertise and training for requisite skills arranged. Jones et al (2009) also argued that evaluations should be carried out with relevant skills, sound methods, adequate resources and transparency in order to be quality. This implies that training of personnel largely determines effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation. Pearce and Robinson (2004) argued that there is need to understand who will work for the monitoring and evaluation system, what skills and knowledge they have, overall human resources available both within the team and externally to support the system. The study found that essential skills for monitoring and evaluation lack even within the school feeding programs’ personnel and therefore training needs to be done. Foresti, (2007) argues this
means not just training, but a whole suite of learning approaches from secondments to research institutes and opportunities to work on impact evaluations within the organization or elsewhere, to time spent by programme staff in evaluation departments and equally time spent by evaluators in the field.

5.3.2 Financial Management and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

The study established that financial management influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation. It is revealed from the study that if finances are properly managed then there is accountability of use of resources which ensures maximum output/results within available financial resources. Gyorkos (2003) argued that a monitoring and evaluation budget should clearly be delineated within the overall project budget to give monitoring and evaluation the due function it plays in project management. This is supported by World Bank (2004) that the budget for monitoring and evaluation should include resources for developing monitoring and evaluation, capacity building, costs for implementation, community and discussion facilitator, information and feedback mechanism, internal learning, documenting experience and provision for scaling up and institutionalization. Estrella and Gaventa (1998) argued that carrying out M&E costs money and depending on how ambitious project implementers are about M&E system, it can cost a lot of money. Conducting M&E requires organizations to invest valuable resources including money and people’s time. The study revealed that budget allocations, financing capacity building and remuneration costs influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program.

5.3.3 Stakeholders’ Participation and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Program

The study revealed that active participation of stakeholders in M&E facilitate faster decision making, feedback, ownership, sustainability hence influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation. Indiana Department of Education (2001) argued that school, parents and community partnerships ensure continuous planning, participation and evaluation of activities that enhance success. Boston Consulting Group (2009) also supports that programs that involve parents, staff and students in operation and management often have greater success. While keeping costs
down, it has an added bonus of increasing community participation creating a sense of ownership. Even though the school administrations are stakeholders, in some instances they are left as observers. The study established that school administrators, students, parents and community influence implementation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County. Time spent garnering support from key school and other community members early on will pay off in the long run when policies are passed and implemented. Buhl and Amanda (2009) argued that it is important to have school administrators engaged in policy process. Their roles include gaining staff support and commitment, allocating resources to support development and implementation of nutrition policies and facilitate communication with families and community. On the other hand engagement of students in all aspects of policy process from development, adoption to evaluation will help assure policies are understood by students and that their implementation is supported by students and other community members.

5.3.4 Donors’ Partnership and Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of School Feeding Programs

The overall impact of donors’ partnership is ensuring continuity of the program and its related activities through funding, availing food and providing technical support. The study revealed that operational support materials influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of SFP. This is supported by Morgan (2007) that different operational support materials like guidelines and training materials, toolkits have been developed by Partners for Child Development and its partners to support data collection and analysis. The study also established that donors’ technical assistance influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of SFP in Langata Sub County. World Food Program (2003) argued that UNICEF offers teacher training, health intervention whereas UNESCO offers technical assistance, program design and evaluation. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation also support the link between school feeding and local agricultural production. This is evident in three impact evaluations, case studies and technical working papers and the provision of technical assistance to countries, especially on the issues of monitoring and evaluation and the link to local agricultural production (WFP, 2013). The study further revealed that direction and external expertise on implementation and design also influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation. Morgan (2007) argued that Partnership for Child Development’s initiative aims to support governments and other stakeholders by
providing direct, evidence-based and context-specific support and expertise to improve design and management of effective school feeding program which use locally sourced food. According to Scopetta (2002), the use of an external evaluator combined with partnership’s involvement in the procedure ensure demonstrable results. Moreover, continuous and internal auditing will help partners maintain reliability and credibility among members.

5.4 Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that the school feeding program monitoring and evaluation in Langata sub-county has illustrated successes as well as challenges. Both have provided critical lessons for addressing M&E agenda of ensuring accountability, transparency, performance and results as envisaged in the Kenyan constitution 2010.

In relation to the first objective that included training of school staff, managerial skills and expertise, knowledge in M&E and the number of M&E staff, the study established that human resource factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program. This is due to the fact that the respondents stated that poor record keeping and inappropriate tools inhibit proper monitoring and evaluation. They also indicated that the staff lacks continuous training on M&E thus inaccurate results. The study has also established that the number of staff involved in M&E is small. This is to mean that implementation of M &E largely depends on agency’s human resource factors.

It is also concluded from the study that financial management influence implementation of M&E. The study reveals that funds required in carrying out some running costs and payments like salaries for cooks and purchase of firewood are ever inadequate leading to poor execution and sustainability of the programs’ activities. Due to inadequate financial resources and expenditure restrictions by donors, the organizations in charge of SFP are therefore unable to carry out continuous M&E and develop a proper M&E system.

Concerning the third objective looking at stakeholders’ participation, it can be concluded that primary stakeholders’ participation is minimal in M&E. This has led to school administrators and parents not offering full support and cooperation required in terms of M&E. Lastly, it can be concluded that donors’ partnership influence implementation of M&E of school feeding program. The study revealed that the schools and community members solely rely on donors’
support for the continuity of the programs’ activities. This has limited the involvement and active participation of the government of Kenya in the programs’ activities.

5.5 Recommendations

The researcher has the following recommendations to make with regard to implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs.

1. The Monitoring and evaluation of School feeding program has numerous weaknesses, which if not redressed will seriously undermine the success of the program. These include low levels of primary stakeholders’ participation in implementation of monitoring and evaluation, poor record keeping, limited technology, lack of schools’ support on M&E, depending on donors’ funding as the only source of finance to run the programs’ activities, inappropriate tools for M&E, high expectations by both organizations and community, poor funds usage and poor feedback mechanisms between the different groups and government organs in the monitoring and evaluation process among others. It’s necessary that the issues raised be looked into.

2. It is important that monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program be strengthened. Kenya as a government has a National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES). It is only logical that NIMES be built in all government institutions including schools. Schools should therefore have a well facilitated M&E department.

3. The organizations in charge of school feeding program should consider adopting a modern information and communications technology in carrying out monitoring and evaluations.

4. There is need to include all stakeholders in project implementation stages as they play an active role since they are the consumers of the project for the sake of sustainability. Cooperation of stakeholders should also be encouraged.
5.6 Recommendation for Further Research

The Suggestion for further research;

1. Determining how to strengthen primary stakeholders’ participation in school feeding program projects particularly how to ensure the beneficiaries can participate effectively in monitoring and evaluating projects.

2. Establishing challenges facing monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program.

3. Influence of information technology system on monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program.
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APPENDIX IV

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

The information provided will only be for the purpose of this study. Read carefully and give appropriate answers by ticking or filling the blank spaces. The information will be treated as confidential.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Indicate your gender (✓) 
   Male ( ) Female ( )

2. By use of a tick (✓), please indicate the age category that applies for you.
   a) Below 30 years ( )
   b) 30 – 34 years ( )
   c) 35 – 39 years ( )
   d) 40 – 44 years ( )
   45 years and above ( )

What is your highest level of education?

- KCSE [ ]
- Diploma [ ]
- Undergraduate [ ]
- Masters [ ]
- PhD [ ]

4 For how long have you been working or interacting with the school feeding programs in your organization in Langata sub-county

Less than 1 year ( )
1 to 5 years ( )
5 to 10 years ( )
11-15 years ( )
over 15 years ( )
PART B: FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ON SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMS

SECTION 1: HUMAN RESOURCE FACTORS.

3. Using a scale 1-5, Please tick (✓) all as appropriate.
   
   5. Very high extent

   To what extent has the following human resource factors influenced the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata sub-county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The training of school staff on M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The managerial skills and expertise in conducting M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff’s knowledge in M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of staff in M&amp;E department influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In your own view how do the human resource factors influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
SECTION 2: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

5. Using a scale 1-5, Please tick (✓) all as appropriate.

5. Very high extent

To what extent has the following financial management factors influenced the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata sub-county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocations and pooled funding influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing capacity building has an influence on implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and feedback mechanism influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building cost influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching cost influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration of M&amp;E staff influences the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. In your own view how does financial management influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

SECTION 3: STAKEHOLDERS’ PARTICIPATION

7. Using a scale 1-5, Please tick (✓) all as appropriate.
   
   5. Very high extent

What is the extent to which the following influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School administrators influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Students themselves influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents and guardians influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community members influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. In your own opinion how does stakeholder participation influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION 3: DONORS’ PARTNERSHIP

9. Using a scale 1-5, Please tick (✓) all as appropriate.


5. Very high extent

To what extent has donors’ partnerships influenced implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor operational support materials on monitoring and evaluation have influence M&amp;E of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors’ technical assistance influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors’ direction and expertise on M&amp;E influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In your own opinion how does donors’ partnership influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
SECTION 4 IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION

11. Using a scale 1-5, Please tick (✔) all as appropriate.
   5. Very high extent

Rate the extent to which the following influence implementation of M&E in your organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of M&amp;E results necessitates implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of M&amp;E increases rate of implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to eliminate fraud cases necessitates implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for efficient M&amp;E process is essential for proper implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for effective M&amp;E process facilitates implementation of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Using a scale 1-5, Please tick (✔) all as appropriate.

   5. Very high extent

To what extent has the results from M&E been utilized in the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Under Consideration</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making regarding implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for additional financial resources in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance review in implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re designing implementation of monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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16 In your own opinion what factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County...

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

17. How frequently do you perform monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

18. What challenges do you experience in implementing monitoring and evaluation in your organization?
   i ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iv…………………………………………………………………………………………

19. Suggest some ways and means of overcoming the challenges identified above.
   i…………………………………………………………………………………………
   ii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iv…………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for participating
APPENDIX V:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. In your own opinion how do the human resource factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………….

2. According to your views, how does financial management influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. How does stakeholders’ participation influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county? Briefly explain

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. In your own opinion how do donors’ partnerships influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding programs in Langata sub-county?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. In your own opinion what factors influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of school feeding program in Langata Sub County...

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
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6. What challenges do you experience in implementing monitoring and evaluation in your organization?
   i ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iv………………

7. Suggest some ways and means of overcoming the challenges identified above.
   i…………………………………………………………………………………………
   ii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iii…………………………………………………………………………………………
   iv…………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for participating
APPENDIX VI

LIST OF SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMS’ SERVICE PROVIDERS IN LANGATA SUB-COUNTY

1. World Food Program (WFP)
2. Institute For Development and Welfare Services (IDEWES)
3. Feed The Children
4. Youth Action for Rural Development
5. Catholic Relief Service (CRS) School feeding
6. Ministry Of Education
7. World Health Organization
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