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**Chapter One: Introduction**

This chapter begins with the background to the study, problem statement study objectives and justification, significance, scope and limitations of the study. The conceptual framework and operational definition of terms are also provided.

* 1. **Background of the Study**

Monitoring is an ongoing process of data collection and analysis for primarily project control with an internally driven emphasis on efficiency of project (Crawford and Brye, 2002). Evaluation is systematic and independent. They are an assessment of an ongoing or completed project including its implementation and results (Uitto, 2004). Monitoring and Evaluation is a combination of two processes which are different yet complementary (Gorgens and Kusek, 2009). It is a process of systematically collecting and analyzing information of ongoing project and comparison of the project outcome/impact against the project intentions (Hunter, 2009).

Monitoring and evaluation systems is a set of components which are related to each other within a structure and serve a common purpose of tracking the implementation and results of a project (SAMDI, 2007). An M&E systems is made up of four interlinked sections, which are: setting up of the M&E systems, implementation of the M&E systems, involvement of the project stakeholders, and communication of the M&E results (Guijt et al., 2002). Theoretically, ‘an ideal M&E systems should be independent enough to be externally credible and socially legitimate, but not so independent to lose its relevance’ (Briceno, 2010). It should therefore be able to influence policy making from recommendations of lessons learned as well as be sustainable overtime for it to be responsive to the needs of the stakeholders.

According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2015A), Monitoring and Evaluation systems enable the private and public sector to accurately assess the activities and as such this enhances accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency of the development progremmes undertaken, which will translate to the realization of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) because IMF has a commitment which is the scope of its operation to the global partnership for SDGs.. Specifically, according to Hiller (2002), Kusek and Rist (2001), Levesque et al, (1996), World Bank (2009), UNAIDs, (2009), Mackay, (2007), Mayne (1997), Mayne & Goni,(1997), McCoy et al, (2005) globalization has reduced the world into a small village and, therefore, more inter connectedness, which calls for governments and organizations to be more accountable, exhibit good governance as an approach to realizing enhanced development. It is therefore against this backdrop that Binnendijk (1999) points out that the demand by international donor and organizations for more accountability requires that recipient countries and organization must enhance result-pegged M&E of policies, programmes and projects. In reference to IMF (2015a), institutions and governments need proper and powerful Monitoring and Evaluation systems as an approach to realizing suitable programme governance and accountability.

Monitoring and Evaluation has evolved overtime due to the need for results-based management (RBM) as well as limited resources and involvement of non-state actors in development (Kusek and Rist, 2001). By the 1970s, major donors such as United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Department for International Development (DFID) and Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) had embraced Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME).

According to Nyonje (2012), project (M&E) is important to different people for various reasons. M&E is important to project managers and their stakeholders (including donors/government) because they need to know the extent to which their project are meeting the set objectives and attaining the desired effects. M&E upholds greater transparency and accountability in the use of project resources, which is particularly, required by funders or development partners (Nyonje, 2012). Third, information developed through the M&E process is vital for improving decision-making.

In Asia, participation in development is generally accepted as a process that is fundamental to addressing issues of ownership and sustainability. Everyone acknowledges the value of participation. Yet when it comes to developing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems many Civil Society Organization (CSOs) continue to employ experts to develop their objectives, indicators and data collection methodologies with very little participation from the very people they engage with (INTRAC, 2008).

In Ghana, the government recognizes that M&E is an essential ingredient in the planning and management development and good governance towards improving on M&E management functions in public and project management functions in public and project agencies in Ghana were not carried out within a comprehensive framework hence did not benefit from the desired synergies. The civil service law, which aims at establishing a policy focused on civil service, prescribes policy planning, monitoring and evaluation structures across all sectors of the economy. At present, monitoring is limited in scope and coverage 9Koranteng, 2000). In Botswana, the only determinant of the efficient management of resources is a factor projection monitoring and evaluation (Hawkins, 2004).

In Kenya, the public benefit Organization Act, 2013 first schedule, part II section 13 on monitoring, evaluation and reporting, calls for the organizations to work together through result-based management in order to meet the needs of their beneficiaries, develop transparent reporting policies and develop and use tools for monitoring and evaluation for development and impact of their work. They are also required to evaluate progress and success they have achieved annually.

In South Sudan, there is rapid growth of NGOs. According to (South Sudan ngo forum, 2012), there are about a thousand operating NGOs. This has spawned demand for greater transparency among government, funders, and the public. Also the increased amounts of funds NGOs attract are estimated to be worth one trillion dollars globally (Crawford, 2004). Given the hundreds, if not thousands of millions of pounds that have been spent by NGOs over the last decade, why has it been so difficult to come to persuasive conclusion about the result of their work? Several different reasons have been examined including assessment of Monitoring and evaluation systems.

In South Sudan, just like any other developing countries, evaluating has yet to reach acceptable levels of operation, since South Sudan had just gained her independent of recent; little had been done on the area of monitoring though not yet formalized due to its state of political status. ‘’Major Evaluations are driven by activities and donor demands’’ (Red Cross, 2013). There is lack of professionalism on the part of qualified practitioners and there are few academically trained evaluators’’. Those who carry out evaluations are influenced by social science research approaches and because of their research background, carry out evaluations that in some cases do not have any characteristics of expert evaluation. For a long time in the government there has been no central monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of programs and project, expect for financial auditing and monitoring that are done to audit. The support that Monitoring and evaluation systems can offer when adopted in institutional development is often not fully understood (UNDP, 2011).

* 1. **Statement of the Problem**

Monitoring and Evaluation has in the recent become a necessary requirement for projects. This is evident from the many advertisements for M&E experts and request for expression of interest for M&E consultants in the local dailies. In under developing countries, South Sudan included, NGOs are faced with several challenges in addition to inability to resourcefully respond to changing needs. Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in South Sudan is weak due to poor leadership, lack of institutional systems, and where it is done the information is not made public to the stakeholders. In addition most NGOs do not have skilled M&E professionals who understand M&E systems and are able to develop appropriate tools; hence they end up with substandard M&E systems that don’t meet donor needs (Chesos, 2010). The study by Koffi-Tessio (2002) also shows that M&E systems are not meeting their obligatory requirements as decision making tool; instead their activities are viewed as controlling by a bureaucratic management style. M&E is also viewed as a donor and not a management requirement (Shapiro, 2011). Jaszczolt el al.,( 2010) in their recommendations emphasized that NGOs staffs need to be educated on M&E through handbooks in order to increase quality, establishment of a national professional association of evaluators to aid in developing technical skills among the M&E specialists. At Lakes State, Rumbek, despite the huge amount of resources provided to implement projects and despite the fact that these projects plays big role in improving the lives of the people in the community, Monitoring and Evaluation faces challenges and therefore, the above performance of Monitoring and Evaluation system doesn’t perform satisfactorily and there is need for the intervention. Monitoring and Evaluation, although very essential in improving performances, is also very complex, multidisciplinary and skill intensive processes. Building a resulted based M&E system is a requirement by the growing pressure to improving performance which is also one of the requirements by the NGO and donor’s to check on the effective use of the donor funds, impact and benefits brought by the projects. Hence there is a need for establishment of rules for constructing minimum parameters for monitoring and evaluation for projects that can be used to track progress and effectiveness (Jha et al, 2010). Research also shows that the foundation for evaluation is being built in many developing countries. Consequently with the growing global movement to demonstrate accountability and tangible results, many developing countries will be expected to adopt results- based M&E systems in the future, due to the international donors focus on development impact. The above shows that the M&E systems are not performing satisfactorily. They are facing challenges that are contributing to their insufficiency and which calls for intervention. This research will look at the existing M&E systems, in regard to An Assessment of Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation system at Lakes State, Rumbek.

* 1. **Research Objectives**

The overall objective of the study is to assess Performance of Monitoring and evaluation systems at Lakes State in South Sudan.

The study specifically seeks to:

1. To explore the tools and methods used in Monitoring and evaluation systems at Lakes State in South Sudan.
2. To establish the influence of management on Performance of Monitoring and evaluation systems.
3. To give recommendations for Monitoring and Evaluation practices.
   1. **Research Question**
4. What are some of the tools and methods used in Monitoring and Evaluation systems at Lakes State in South Sudan?
5. In what ways does management influence Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems at Lakes State in South Sudan?
6. How does training of employees affect Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation systems at Lakes State in South Sudan?
7. To what extend does Stakeholders involvements affect Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation systems at Lakes State?
   1. **Justification of the Study**

There is need to assess the performance of Monitoring and evaluation systems because M&E has therefore emerged as a key policy development and performance management tool. The economic policy makers need the information generated from M&E functions to improve their economic policies while donors and stakeholders need M&E findings to ensure accountability of resources while at the same time improving the overall effectiveness of the policies (Mackay, 2007).

Monitoring and evaluation faces challenges and therefore, Monitoring and evaluation systems don’t perform satisfactorily and there is need for the intervention. There have been reports by donors decrying the inadequate monitoring and evaluation of projects implemented by NGOs (World Bank, 2007). This research will look at the existing M&E systems, used by Lakes State, South Sudan and will generate solutions for it to perform satisfactorily. In an era of demanding donor expectations regarding financial probity, budgetary transparency and the activities done by NGOs as well as proven impact value of programs, Monitoring and Evaluation remains one of those aspects of organization management that is extensively discussed but rarely practiced and therefore this study will analysis the reasons why M&E systems is not practiced will provide the value of M&E systems to organization performance.

The weakness of monitoring and evaluation is mentioned from time to time donor organizations have given instructions on improvement of Monitoring and evaluation systems through training, little has improved as thought. A solution is needed urgently to avert the poor performance of Monitoring and evaluation systems which requires investigations.

* 1. **Significance of the Study**

This study will be useful to several stakeholders, Government of South Sudan through the NGO coordination bureau, future researchers and academicians. M&E systems are a new area that has emerged with the calls for result based management and or performance related management. Hence this will add to the small existing body of literature on the subject. To the project managers and NGOs this study will in maximization of strengths of M&E systems. In addition, both the nongovernmental organizations as well as project management practitioners will benefit from the study as it will contribute to body of knowledge. It is important for the project practitioners” to understand the dynamics of monitoring and evaluation to the implementation of projects.

Monitoring and Evaluation can be used as a powerful tool to improve the way organizations and stakeholders can achieve greater accountability and transparency. The study is therefore beneficial to NGOs, donor agencies, project managers and project management students who are involved in the designing and implementation of result-based Monitoring and evaluation systems. This study will critique Monitoring and evaluation systems and try to adopt the solution that will be used by NGOs in South Sudan.

* 1. **Scope and Limitation of the Study**

The study will be conducted at Lakes State, Rumbek South Sudan. The study focused on the assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation systems in Lakes State, Rumbek South Sudan. Some of the respondents were not be willing to give the required information fearing that it might be used against them. To overcome this challenge, participants were briefed on the purpose of the study that is being undertaken and information given will be used for the purpose of the study. The respondents will also be assured of anonymity when giving information since the questionnaires doesn’t require a person’s identity.

**Chapter two: Literature Review**

This chapter covered a review of literature related to the assessment of Performance of Monitoring and evaluation systems. It specifically reviewed literature under four thematic areas that included tools and methods used in M&E systems, influence of management on M&E systems, the relationship between training of employees on M&E systems and performance and how stakeholder involvement in M&E systems affect performance.

**2.1 Review of Empirical Studies**

**a)**  **Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in the World**

Globally, Monitoring and evaluation systems have been in existence since the ancient times Kusek (2004), however today, the requirements for M&E systems as a management tool to show performance has grown with demand by stakeholders for accountability and transparency through the application of the monitoring and evaluation by the NGOs and other institutions including the government (Gorgens et al, 2010). Development banks and bilateral aid agencies also regularly apply M&E to measure development effectiveness as well as demonstrate transparency (Briceno, 2010). In the UK, the largest NGOs are struggling with the complex issues associated with aggregating their experience on large scale (Davies, 2000).

In Yemen, M&E functions of a project were carried out by the M&E department of a government agency had much experience and was able to commence project M&E activities at an early stage. However, the agency did not have direct access to the project’s M&E resources and had limited funds. Obtaining authorization for activities and resources was a lengthy procedure. This affected M&E budgeting and adoption of M&E systems recommended by the project. The government agency did not prioritize M&E for this project and so the organizational structure was hindering effective adoption of M&E systems (Furman, 2001).

**b) Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Africa**

The Kenya social protection sector review (2012), that focused on main programmes in the social protection sector in Kenya, conducted through literature review, landscape survey and in-depth interviews with project implementers, states that not many programmes in Kenya have a functional, M&E systems, despite it being accredited for promoting transparency and accountability. This was attributed to programmes not allocating the required resources at the design stage of the M&E systems. There was also an inconsistency in the choice of performance indicators among Kenyan programmes which led to incoherent and incomprehensive M&E systems. The review also established that although M&E rarely influenced the decision making process, it information was being used to inform project and programme designs as well as inform policies. The review also notes that the country relies much on M&E international consultants and therefore recommends capacity building of national and progressive wean programme of civil servants (locals) because they will stay in the sector over the long team.

The study by Koffi-Tessio (200), on Efficacy and Efficiency of Monitoring –Evaluation Systems (MES) for Projects Financed by the Bank Group that was done in Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Kenya, Rwanda and Mozambique, through desk review and interviews, for projects approved between 1987 and 2000. Monitoring –Evaluation systems are not meeting their obligatory requirements as decision making tool; instead their activities are viewed as controlling by a bureaucratic management. The poor acquisition of the appropriate M&E systems by NGOs is also attributed to the organizations over emphasis on the physical infrastructure (for instance computer equipment’s working capital etc.) rather than methodological and conceptual training.

**C) Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in South Sudan**

A United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) report of 2012 reviewed the key challenges to M&E systems in South Sudan as part of a broader review of UNDP activities supported by the Global Fund to Fight AIDs, Tuberculosis and Malaria (UNDP, 2012). Based on additional interview-based reviews and analyses of M&E activities, a list of adaptations to standardized M&E procedures in response to post-conflict environmental challenges was developed. The findings of the report were that development and implementation of M&E systems in post-conflict environments required extensive adaptations to conventional procedures. Flexible and adaptable as well as ‘diplomatically sensitized’ M&E systems are considered to be essential to the successful completion of M&E- related activities, and may also contribute to broader international relations, ‘nation-building’ and peace-keeping goals.

The Department For International Development (DFID) SouthSudan works with partner institutions to ensure that all new projects have a monitoring strategy, including metadata for programme monitoring, plans for data collection, reporting , programme evaluation and risk management. These will include partnerships with third parties with specialist expertise in specific sectors (DFID, 2014). Accordingly, the implementing partners are responsible for day to day programme monitoring. For each new Programme, DFIP has the responsibility of deciding whether an independent evaluation is required depending on its size, strategic importance, and degree of novelty and the strength of pre-existing evidence. The outcomes of the evaluations are shared with partners and stakeholders. DFID South Sudan also identifies a staff member to be trained and accredited to the evaluation cadre to provide advice and support to the office (DFID, 2014).

**2.2 Tools and Methods used in M&E Systems**

Projects require different M&E needs depending on the operating context, implementing agency capacity and donor requirements. It is therefore important, when preparing an M&E plan to identify methods, procedures, and tools to be used to meet the project’s M&E needs (Chaplowe, 2008). There are many tools and techniques used to aid project managers in planning and controlling project activities which include: project selection and risk management tools and techniques; project initiation tools and techniques; project management planning tools and techniques; project management executing tools and techniques; and project management monitoring and controlling tools and techniques.

M&E systems use different tools and approaches, some of which are either complementary or substitute to each other, while others are either broad or narrow (World Bank, 2002). An evaluator however may choose to use a combination of methods and sources of information in order to cross-validate data (Nabris, 2002). The M&E systems tools include performance indicators, logical framework approach, theory-based evaluation, and formal surveys, rapid appraisal methods, participatory methods, and public expenditure tracking surveys, impact evaluation, cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis. The selections of these tools however depend on the information needed stakeholders and the cost involved (World Bank, 2002).

There are also two main methods of data collection which are formal and less formal methods (Nabris, 2002). Formal methods although expensive, have a high degree of reliability and validity and include surveys, participatory observations, and direct measurements among others. Less formal methods which are rich in information, subjective and intuitive, hence less precise in conclusion, they include, field visits and unstructured interviews. In order to increase the effectiveness of an M&E systems, the monitoring and evaluation plan and design need to be prepared as an integral part of the project (Nabris, 2002).

Organizations like United States Agency for International Development (USAID) policy on M&E require that their grant recipients document their M&E systems in a performance management plan, which is a tool designed to help them set up and manage the process of monitoring, analyzing, evaluating and reporting progress towards achieving objectives (USAID, 2012). The performance management plan also serves as a reference document that contains targets, a detailed definition of each project indicator, the methods and frequency of data collections, as well as who is responsible for collecting the data. It will also provide details on how data will be analyzed and evaluations required to complement monitoring data.

M&E systems vary with type, sector and country of application, (Koffi-Tessio, 2002 and Fitzgerald et al., 2009). A successful M&E systems therefore should be modified to specific setting with allowance for flexibility and imagination (Jha et al, 2010). When establishing an M&E systems, organization should also consider experiences from other organizations (Briceno, 2010).

There is therefore need to realizing the role and use of M&E systems as well as involvement of stakeholders since M&E has many audiences, who include managers, donor, field staff, partners, policy makers and program participants (CARE, 2012), thus the need for it to effectively communicate. A well prepared and executed M&E will contribute to both project outcomes and international standards of doing things (Jha et al, 2010).

According to the experience drawn from USAID Turkey M&E plan, best practices not only include linking M&E to strategic work plans, but also focusing on efficiency and cost effectiveness, employing a participatory approach to monitoring progress, utilizing both international and local expertise, disseminating results widely, using data from multiple sources, and facilitating the use of data for program improvement (Mathis et al. 2001). This is because the M&E systems that are set based on acceptable best practices’’ aid in making data based’’ decisions as well as provide donors with evidence based project results. Hence M&E is a project asset (Mathis et al, 2001). However M&E in capacity building is still in the initial stages of development, and the standards and approaches to the tool have not been set. In instances of urgency to meet emergent social needs in Africa, the M&E is not prioritized, because there is no one-size-fit-all M&E strategy (Fitzgerald et al, 2009).

As mentioned earlier, and reaffirming the importance of M&E tools as the backbone of this study, there is need for management commitment in the accessing and proper use of each tool to produce the expected results. There should be enough finances to cater for these tools and ensure their sustainability through effective training of the personnel to use them. However, in most projects there is little being done towards implementation of a Monitoring and evaluation systems which is impact driven (DAC, 2005). In most cases the practice of M&E is a routine process with no much expected from it (Kusters, 2011), and is a way of pleasing donors (World bank, 2004) and the production of quality results is not seen (UNDP, 2002). There is no allocation of staff specific to the monitoring and evaluation department and thus the level of specialization is low (Chaplowe, 2008, UN-HABITAT, 2003). There is need for management to show commitment towards implementing a strong and sustainable Monitoring and evaluation systems for effectiveness of their projects (World Bank. 200). This will eventually lead to the allocation of proper budget to cater for the enormous monitoring and evaluation needs (khan, 2003), leading to trained staff with relevant skills for monitoring and evaluation (IFAD, 2002).

**2.2.1 Training of Employees on M&E Systems**

Any organization is only is only as strong as its human resource capabilities. An organization without the right people with the right training is as good as dead (Musomba et al, 2013). As revealed by Musomba (2013), the technical team’s ability to conduct evaluations and the value of participation of human resources in policymaking process, motivation to impact decisions can be huge determinants of how the M&E lessons are learnt, communicated and perceived.

M&E practical training is important in capacity building of personnel because it helps with the interaction and management of the M&E systems. M&E training starts with the understanding of the M&E theory and ensuring that the team understands the linkages between the project theory of change and the results framework as well as associated indictors (CPWF, 2012). Training should therefore be practical focused to ensure the understanding (CPWF, 2012). Theory of change also known as the program theory/result chain/program logic model/ attribution logic (Perrin, 2012); it is a causal logic that links research activities to the desired changes in the actors that a project targets to change. It is therefore a model of how a project is supposed to work. The function of theory of change is to provide a road map (CPWF, 2012 and Perrin, 2012).

Organizations that ignore the training aspect in M&E find themselves faced with a number of challenges. According to Schwalle (2006), people knowledgeable in work need to plan the work and hence be able to work. Technical capacity is the most important in the project management because without it no completion of the project will be possible. The technical work of any project need to be done by qualified staff so that the quality of work is of high standard; there is lack of professional and technical supervision, which has led to poor project quality. In addition there is low community participation in monitoring and evaluation due to the in adequacy of data and general information about implementation process in an organization.

The UNDP (2009) handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation for development results, emphasizes that human resource is vital for an effective monitoring and evaluation, by stating that staff working should possess the required technical expertise in the area in order to ensure high-quality monitoring and evaluation. Implementing of an effective M&E demands for the staff to undergo training as well as process skills in research and project management, hence capacity building is critical (Nabris, 2002). In-turn numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for NGO staffs working in project, in order to provide them with practical tools that will enhance result-based management by strengthening awareness in M&E (Hunter, 2009). They also give many practical examples and exercise, which are useful since they provide the staff with ways of becoming efficient, effective and have impact on the provides (Shapiro, 2011).

According to Cole (2002), the purpose of training is mainly to improve knowledge and skills. Changing technology requires that employees possess the knowledge, skills and abilities needed to cope with new processes and production techniques. Cole (2002) further argued that training brings a sense of security at the workplace which reduces labor turnover and absenteeism is avoided; change management training helps to manage change by increasing the understanding and involvement of employees in the change process and also provides the skills and abilities needed to adjust to new to new situations; provide recognition, enhanced responsibility and possibility of increase promotion; give a feeling of personal satisfaction and achievement, and broaden opportunities for career progression; and help to improve the availability and quality of staff.

There is no organization without a human resource aspect. The human resource capabilities determine a lot for company in term of achieving its goals. The technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking process, and their motivation to impact decisions, can be huge determinants of how the evaluation’s lessons are produced, communicated and perceived (Vanessa & Gala, 2011).

Training for the requisite skills should be arranged for human resources if they are inadequate and they should be given clear job allocation and designation befitting their expertise. 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, 2002).

Employee needs vary. As Maslow explained in the hierarchy theory the employee goes through different levels to have that feeling of accomplishment. The attention by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by the employee (Pearce & Robinson, 2004). Odekunle (2001) argues that the 21st Century employee relies more on virtual training and access to online training takes precedence, as opposed to the classroom training. However, if the organization is not ready to embrace the changing technology, employee training will not meet the intended objectives. Whenever possible, visual presentations to illustrate functions, examples, and how to use the different M&E tools should be incorporated. Kenney (1992) stated that training programmes should be reviewed during and after its completion by the training officer, the line manager, and if necessary, by the trainers themselves. Evaluation differs from validation in that it attempts to measure the overall cost benefit of the training program and not just the achievement. Further, Foresti (2007) argues that training means much more, not just training, but a whole suite of learning approaches: from secondment to research institutes and opportunities to work on impact evaluations within the organization or elsewhere, to time spent by program staff in evaluation departments and equally, time spent by evaluators in the field. This helps the employee to be more versatile in today’s world. Evaluation must also be independent and relevant. Independence is achieved when it is carried out by entities and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention (Gaarder & Briceno, 2010; OECD, 2002)

**2.2.2 Stakeholder Involvement on M&E Systems**

The concept of stakeholder’’ participation in development projects has evolved over time. Its roots can be traced back to community and popular participation promoted mainly by nongovernmental organizations (NHOs) in the 1950s and 1960s. In the late 1970s and 1980s multilateral agencies such as Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and Organizational labor Organization (ILO) began to promote stakeholder participation in development projects and programmes. The limited success of many development initiatives was attributed to failure to involve people in the adoption of Monitoring and evaluation systems for project management (FAO, 1990, World Bank, 1998). Continued stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation cannot be assumed, it must be institutionalized. The UNDP handbook of M&E for results endorses specific measures that must be built into program and project management processes to ensure involvement of stakeholders in an effective and rolling basis (UNDP, 2002).

Kakabadse (2005) in the extensive review on the stakeholder approach expressed that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and stakeholder interest complement each other. In line with this, Hillman (2001) noted that a firm has relationships with constituent stakeholders group and the processes and outcomes associated with these relationships depend on the interest. The interests of all the stakeholders have valve and focus of stakeholder theory is on managerial decisions makings Bakabadse et al (2005), therefore, concluded that managers should pay attention to stakeholders.

Monitoring and evaluation systems have been in existence since the ancient times (Kusek and Rist, 2004), however today, the requirements for M&E systems as a management tool to show performance has grown with demand by stakeholders for accountability and transparency through the application of the monitoring and evaluation by NGOs and other institutions, including the government (Gorgens et al, 2010). Development banks and bilateral aid agencies also regularly apply M&E to measure development effectives as well as measurement for transparency (Briceno, 2010).

The ideal situation is the involvement of all stakeholders including the donors, community, beneficiaries and people in the planning and implementation of the project in all stages of monitoring and evaluation throughout the duration of the project. In consultation and collaboration with all these, they determine what is to be monitored and evaluated, how monitoring and evaluation is to take place including identification of indicators, they do the analysis of the data and assess the performance of the project and also offer guidance on how to proceed with the project (CORE,2006; AND Bradle et al, 2002). Monitoring and Evaluation should be integral components of the project management cycle including project planning and design. Thinking in terms of monitoring and evaluation at the design stage facilitates the projects stakeholders to think in terms of performance measurement even before implementation starts with a clear picture of expectations of what a successful project would look like (PASSIA, 2004).

Orma and Koning (2003), state that more parties will be disappointed, as not all wishes may become reality and stakeholders may create excessive expectations. This will also be the case monitoring the project under time pressure or without stakeholders; as a result parties may feel passed on and de-motivated. Stakeholder involvement may also become entangled when the view and opinion of stakeholder changes over time when complexity increases and insight may decrease. Further, the World Bank (2004), states that stakeholders should be involved in identifying the project, the objectives and goals and identification of indicators that will be used in monitoring and evaluation. The stakeholders are also involved in collection and analysis of the data and capturing the lessons. The role of the managers of the projects is to facilitate the monitoring evaluation process. The ideal way is the involvement of all stakeholders including the donors, community, beneficiaries and people involved in the planning and implementation of the project in all stages of monitoring and evaluation throughout the duration of the project.

In consultation and collaboration with all these, they determine what is to be monitored and evaluated, how monitoring and evaluation is to take place including identification of indicators, they do the analysis of the data and assess the performance of the project and be able to generate guidance on how to proceed with the project (CORE, 2006; AND Bradle et al, 2002). Existing literature suggest that lack of stakeholder’s participation in the adoption of Monitoring and evaluation systems is the barrier to proper monitoring and evaluation. Stakeholder’s participation in the entire project is very critical because it is evident that as soon as the donors pull out from the project site and technicians leave the project collapse.

Stakeholder’s involvement increases the legitimacy of the decision making process and reinforcement of democratic practices (NEA, 2004). The project team must also pay proper attention to the identification and impact assessment of projects decisions made by stakeholders outside their influence authority (Ireland, 2002). Project monitoring consist of the collection and interpretation of data and reporting information in relation to the project plans, planning and requirements, close interaction with the stakeholders is needed. Lock (2007), observed that early involvement of stakeholders in the adoption of Monitoring and evaluation systems may also pose some disadvantages. The slowing down of the decision making progress is often mentioned which may turn out costly and very undesired for in the current economic situation. As the range and nature of stakeholders in the project monitoring and evaluation will vary, the appropriate means and depth of dealing with the parties should be properly assessed; spending valuable time on insignificant stakeholders is money down the drain. An increased number of stakeholders will mean more influence, so substantial alignment is needed. Lack of space for key project stakeholders to be involved in the adoption of the Monitoring and evaluation systems leaved outcomes and impacts to be measured by ‘experts’ who have no vested interest in the success of the project other than for reporting to senior managers or even donors (INTRAC, 2008). In his studies on partnership of M&E for community water projects, Allando (2005) observed that participatory project monitoring and evaluation is one way through which various stakeholders and especially the primary stakeholder can be involved in managing the local projects.

**2.3 Chapter Summary**

As the literature indicated, there were many studies conducted by different researchers. The study assessed Monitoring and evaluation systems and performance of projects in different parts of the world. Related studies in Kenya and others countries globally and have been analyzed and reveal that there exists a knowledge gap in Monitoring and evaluation system’s and performance. In conclusion, from the literature review done and a review of empirical studies that have been done, it shows that a lot of effort has been put in place to have a result-based and effective M&E systems. The empirical studies are indicative that there is need for Monitoring and Evaluation as a management tool for decision making. However, little has been done on area of assessment of Monitoring and evaluation systems and performance on projects in the developing countries, as far as tools and methods used. Management influence on M&E is minimal, personnel training on monitoring and evaluation and stakeholder’s involvement on M&E systems has not fully taken course on projects.

Concern about absence of effective approaches in assessing Monitoring and evaluation systems has been raised. Proposals made in Projects have gone through the cracks, with no lasting solution given. Factors such as stakeholders’’ participation have been substituted with ready availability of funding, with assumption that the local’’ views may not have an impact to the project successes. The program theory of evaluation has been used in assessing projects in Sub-Saharan Africa, although substantial M&E achievements on the ground are rare. Most studies done focused on developed countries and a few developing countries hence ignoring South Sudan due to factors like insecurity and lack of adequate time to do such assessments.

A lot of studies have focused on NGOs Monitoring and evaluation systems in general and mostly based on selections of tools and techniques, finance, expertise and donor influence on M&E. having identified research gaps, the researcher is keen on assessing the M&E systems and performance of Projects in South Sudan.

**Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology**

This chapter focused on research design, target population, sample size, sampling procedures, data collection, procedures and data analysis techniques, methods and instruments of data collection, pilot study , instrument reliability, instrument validity and ethical considerations of the study. A discussion of each aspect of the methodology was given hereunder, beginning with research design.

**3.1 Research Design**

According to Trochim (2005), Research design is the back bone of research as it provides the components and plan for the success in carrying out the study and creates framework upon which answers to research questions can be sought. In this study, cross sectional research design was employed to enable respondents describe the state of affair and assessment of performance of monitoring and evaluation systems at Lakes State, Rumbek in South Sudan.

**3.2 Study and Target Population**

A population is an identifiable total group or aggregation of elements (people) that are of interest to a researcher and pertinent to the specified information problem. This includes defining the population from which the sample is drawn. According to Salkind (2008), population is the entire of some groups. This is also supported by Sekaran and Bougie (2010); population is defined as entire group of people the researchers want to investigate. Target population or population of interest refers to the group of people of interest whom the researcher desires and intends to investigate. The target population for this study was staff in Western Lakes State South Sudan wash programme and personnel in the administrative, finance and human resource departments. A representative sample was selected from the target population through a defined scientific methodology of sampling.

**3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure**

According to Kothari (2014), a sample of about 10% of a population can often give a reliable data. A survey study was conducted on all the personnel working under wash programme and in administrative, finance and human resource departments since their number is small (Cooper & Morgan, 2008). The sample size for this was 100 from the population. This was done ensure proportionality in the sampling. Further, purposive sampling was used to select two payam executive administrators and/or their deputies in Rumbek County to represent stakeholder view.

**3.4 Methods and Instruments of Data Collection**

The researchers used questionnaires, interview guides and focus group discussions for collecting data. The questionnaires were used because they are easy to administer and at the same time they generate a large layout of needed data. Questionnaires are economical, ensure anonymity, and permit use of standardized questions, save time especially the self-administered as the respondents have an ample time to think and fill the questionnaires at ease, hence minimizing errors.

Document analysis is a method of data collection from documented sources. The researcher also used document analysis to gather information that is not captured in the responses in the questionnaires and others used. The information was collected from paper documents as well as computer databases. Document analysis has advantages over other data collection methods because the documents are expected to be complete, detailed, and consistent and well structured. They also save time since they are readily available.

**3.5 Data Collection Procedures**

The researcher administered questionnaire personally to the respondents. The advantage of researcher administered questionnaires is that the questions can be clarified to the respondents during the interview. This ensured that the respondents understood the questions, thereby enabling the research to obtain the right kind of information required to meet the study objectives. A researcher-administered questionnaire is also a more efficient method of data collection in terms of research time (Whiting, 2008). Interviews were conducted with key informant persons within the organization. These include heads of departments, M&E experts, consultants and senior managers. This enabled gather additional information which may not have been captured by the questionnaire.

**3.6 Data Analysis Procedures**

This is the process of collecting, modeling and transforming data in order to highlight useful information, suggesting conclusions and supporting decision making (Sharma, 2005). The Researcher collected the data, using questionnaires, interview guides, focus group discussion and document analysis. The data that was collected was examined and checked for completeness and clarity. Quantitative data that was analyzed using descriptive statistics while qualitative data was also analyzed using content analysis. However, qualitative data was also transformed into quantitative data and analyzed by the helped of SPSS in accordance with the main objectives of the study.

**3.7 Validity and Reliability**

The quality of data collection instruments was checked using validity and reliability test. Validity of the questionnaire was obtained by checking all questioners using professional experts; including the researcher’s advisor and construct validity is determined by expert judgment. Beside to ensure reliability, the questionnaire was pre-tested to a small group of employees before going in to actual data collection and reliability test was conducted using Cronbach alpha to ensure the reliability of the questioners.

**3.8 Ethical Considerations of the Study**

By considering scientific research ethics, the research proposal and data collection instruments were reviewed and approved. The researcher had explained the objectives of the study and the research was conducted for academic purpose only. Participants were informed that their participation in the study is voluntary and can be declined or withdrew at any time of the study period. Employee’s information was collected anonymously. Those who agree to participate in the interviews undertook an informed verbal consent process before the interview and informed of the risks and benefits associated with participating in this study. All information provided by study participants will be anonymous and confidential.
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