

Assessing Approaches to Strengthen Monitoring and Evaluation in Development Projects: Evidence from Donor-Funded Projects in Machakos County, Kenya

John Kimote¹
Serah Kimaru Muchai²

¹kimanthij@gmail.com (+254723780984)
²swkimaru@mku.ac.ke/sarahmuchai@yahoo.com (+254722566721)

^{1,2}Mt. Kenya University, Kenya

ABSTRACT

Monitoring and Evaluation improves the quality of programme or project management since it provides information on how results namely outcomes, outputs and impact are achieved and assesses the effectiveness, relevance, coherence, efficiency, impact and sustainability of specific development interventions. The objectives of the study were to examine the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation among development project teams in Machakos County and to assess the influence of M & E as a learning tool on implementation of development projects in Machakos County, Kenya. The study was guided by the Theory of Change which describes how particular interventions or sets of interventions lead to specific changes. The target population of this study was 102 programme staff implementing donor-funded projects. A census was done and therefore the target group formed the sample for the study. Primary data sources used were key informant interviews and a survey questionnaire. Quantitative data was analyzed in SPSS Version 28 and qualitative data was thematically analyzed. According to the survey results, 58.2% agreed that the involvement of all relevant project stakeholders during the preliminary stages of project design strengthens M&E. The survey results showed that 49.45% of the respondents agreed that project planning reflected the various community needs and supported decision-making processes during project implementation. A majority (58.23%) agreed that feedback from various stakeholders was often incorporated and used to strengthen the delivery of various project activities informant interviews. Majority of the survey respondents (72%) indicated that learning is integral to ensuring M&E is effective and project teams can learn immensely from M & E. A majority (71%) agreed that project teams feared participating in M&E activities due to fear that it could be used against them. The findings show that the involvement of stakeholders in project design and implementation directly influenced successful project M & E. The study recommended involving relevant parties and stakeholders in a project since this influences its implementation and M & E among donor-funded development projects. Project managers need to put in place incentives for project teams to learn not just for reporting to funding agencies but for the benefit of internal learning among project teams.

Key Words: Development Projects, Evaluation, Monitoring, Program, Project

I. INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) emerged from a growing recognition among practitioners and scholars that effective project management goes beyond simple implementation and is instead linked to well-designed monitoring and evaluation systems (Witkowski, 2020). M & E of programmatic interventions is intended to contribute to accountability, team and individual learning, support favorable changes, and improve implementation and management of programmes or projects (Therese et al., 2022). According to the Evaluation Quality Standards by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), M & E improves the quality of project management since it provides valuable information on how results namely outputs, outcomes and impact have been achieved and assesses the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability of specific development interventions (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2022).

Despite these intended benefits, weak approaches to M & E process are often prevalent, and this can overshadow the overall purpose and objectives of M & E. There is burgeoning evidence to support that monitoring and evaluation of various programmatic interventions is frequently affected by the use of weak approaches and this is caused by a number of underlying triggers (Musyoka, 2020). For instance, this can come out of disagreements on the evaluation approaches, methods, and interpretation of the evaluation results or the contexts in which the evaluation occurs, such as particular programmatic features and characteristics (Linfield & Posavac, 2018; Mertens & Wilson, 2019).

The use of efficacious approaches to monitoring and evaluation is emerging as a popular method of improving M & E programmatic interventions (Turner, 2022). In Australia, improving M & E processes through the application of various approaches has been found to enhance the impact of evaluation processes for projects (Zare et al., 2021). In

the United Kingdom, Boaz et al. (2018) reports that better engagement of stakeholders in a project design and implementation improves its evaluation process and develops a set of principles to guide stakeholder engagement in M & E. Gayithri (2019) notes that more dedication and commitment and dedication from both senior and programmatic level staff is key to strengthening and improving M & E processes in Canada. In Ghana, Sulemana et al. (2018) note that often key stakeholders are not fully involved in the monitoring and evaluation process mainly due to poor attitudes towards M & E. This limited involvement contributes to poor appreciation of M & E. In Zambia, efforts have been made to improve, build, strengthen and sustain more robust and effective M & E systems. This includes strategies such as improved ownership, integration, linkage, coordination and oversight over most programme interventions (Kanyamuna et al., 2020). In Kenya, Musyoka (2020) calls for the need to strengthen M & E processes for programmes and projects. Such approaches include formal training to ensure goals, requirements, limitations and components of M & E systems are well understood. This also equips staff with the necessary implementation skills. In addition, all team members need to integrate M & E in their field activities to ensure that they internalize their participatory approach and learn the techniques of M & E.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

A significant challenge encountered in programme and project management is the fear among project stakeholders, including managers and staff, that Monitoring and Evaluation findings may be used against their work and personal performance. This is in sharp contrast to the main objectives of M & E, which are the assessment of the achievement of intended outcomes and supporting favorable changes to improve the implementation and management of programmes or projects. This is because M & E systems often require accountability from project/programme managers since they are responsible for programme/project activities. Thus, they can be hesitant and resistant to the critical role and learning objectives of M & E. As a result, a lack of strong monitoring and evaluation systems often emerges, further exacerbating the keen caution to avoid, limit, or entirely forfeit involvement in M & E processes. A lack of strong M & E approaches persists among project/programme teams, and this calls into question whether project managers and staff fully understand their roles in M & E systems adopted by their organizations.

Further, existing project management and implementation research pushes the role of effective approaches that strengthen M & E processes to the periphery. Thus, there is a dearth of research focusing on in-depth analysis of empirical evidence on approaches to developing strong M & E programmatic interventions. As part of the empirical research response measures that contribute to addressing the problem, this study assessed the plausibility and practical relevance of approaches, namely, participatory monitoring and evaluation, the provision of a stimulating and knowledge-sharing environment, and the use of monitoring and evaluation as a learning tool to strengthen project and programme M & E processes. It is expected that applying the right approaches strengthens M & E of programmatic interventions. To this end, the study assessed approaches to strengthen M & E processes in development projects, drawing on evidence from donor-funded projects in Machakos County, Kenya.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

- i. To examine the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on effective implementation of development projects in Machakos County, Kenya.
- ii. To assess the influence of M & E as a learning tool on the effective implementation of development projects in Machakos County, Kenya.

1.3 Research Questions

- i. What is the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on the effective implementation of development projects in Machakos County, Kenya?
- ii. How does the use of M & E as a learning tool affect the effective implementation of development projects in Machakos County, Kenya?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Literature Review

2.1.1 Theory of Change

The Theory of Change (ToC) was advanced by the works of Weiss (1995) and it illustrates the relationship between specific interventions and expected outcomes. According to ToC, programme/project evaluation should be based on theories of change which show how particular projects/programmes are going to work (Weiss, 1972). According to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework [UNDAF], (2014), theories of change illustrate how specific project/programme interventions create specific changes. Further, change theories provide solutions to

overcome impediments to effective programme implementation and indicate the results of a specific program/project if it is successfully implemented.

2.1.2 Social Learning Theory

The Social Learning Theory (SLT) was proposed by Bandura (1971), and its main emphasis is that people learn through interacting and observing each other. According to the theory, people take into consideration the apparent consequences of the actions of other people in their environment and consider what might occur to them if they copy or rehearse the behavior portrayed by other individuals (Firmansyah & Saepuloh, 2022). In the context of monitoring and evaluations, social learning theory supports that learning can occur amongst programme or project staff through social learning and this can strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of projects/programmes.

2.2 Empirical Review

In Australia, Purdue et al. (2018) investigated the participation of youth in project monitoring and evaluation. The study was done under the purview that growing youth populations particularly in low- and middle-income countries calls for more investments in young people to leverage positive outcomes from development interventions. The study draws on data from literature and experiences from youth-led evaluations in Oaktree (Australia's largest youth-led organization focusing on international development). The study calls for greater youth participation and involvement in development programme evaluations and urges communities to work with young people to advance the important role of youth participation in M & E.

Lee et al. (2022) examines how participatory frameworks influence evaluations. In a scoping review, the study assesses how evaluation frameworks and criteria are influenced by participatory approaches. The study develops and recommends the use of a participatory, cross-sectional evaluation framework for programmes. Further, the framework underscores significant implications for policy-making, community learning, and the continuous improvement of participatory evaluation methods. In Spain, Soto et al. (2021) evaluated participatory monitoring and evaluation in farming projects. The study reports that the involvement of farmers in evaluation enhanced knowledge exchange, capacity building, and learning from implemented projects. Further, it supported better decision-making, and evaluation of projects because of the direct effect it had on project efficiency, inclusivity, and sustainability of realized outcomes.

In Ghana, Akanbang and Abdallah (2021) carried out a case study of participatory monitoring and evaluation in local governments in Ghana's Lambussie District. Primary data was gathered using six key informant interviews and a total of eight FDGs. The study established that there was a lack of adequate provisions to use PME at Ghana's local government levels. Further, there was an absence of robust accountability and feedback mechanisms which hampered PME use at local levels. In Uganda, Kananura et al. (2017) explore how the use of participatory M & E methods has influenced programme implementation in eastern Uganda. The study drew data from a retrospective reflection of different approaches to M & E applied in a project focusing on maternal and newborn health implemented in three districts located in eastern Uganda. Methodologies used included the use of key informants, formal surveys, and participatory impact pathway analysis. Results from the study indicated that participatory M & E approaches were critical to realizing significant impact during and after project implementation.

Iddi and Nuhu (2018) investigated the types of challenges and opportunities for the participation of communities in govern projects in the Bagamoyo District of Tanzania. Using purposive sampling, 55 beneficiaries and 17 key informants were selected and interviewed using in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. Observations were also used to collaborate with collected data. Findings from the study indicated that participation of communities in M & E still faced a number of different challenges. However, despite these challenges, the participation of communities in projects must not be ignored and Iddi and Nuhu (2018) recommend that local communities need to be more actively involved in project decision-making. This should include building their capacities through technical support focusing on monitoring and evaluation.

In Kenya, Leariwalla (2021) investigated how participatory M & E practices influence the performance of projects funded by the National Government Constituency Development Fund. Using descriptive research design and stratified random sampling, 30 funded projects were sampled and primary data was collected using questionnaires. The results established that the close participation of community members in project M & E can be beneficial to the overall project implementation since community members can feel a sense of ownership of the various projects under implementation. This has the effect of improving the overall impact that a project has on a particular community.

Karimi et al. (2021) examined how stakeholder involvement in M & E influences the performance outcomes among educational projects in primary schools in Kenya. Using descriptive survey design and drawing on data from questionnaires, the study quantitatively analyzed the relationship between the variables that were under study. Key findings showed that stakeholder capacity building is part of the PME process and urged programme managers to

ensure that all stakeholders are brought on board during the design and implementation of projects to increase the levels of project outcomes.

Wyrozowski and Pawlak (2021) investigated the role and meaning of various project lessons learned and how this can be used to encourage learning and positive attitudes among project teams. The study used hypothesis testing on data gathered from an online survey of project management professionals located in Poland. The findings of the study revealed that project managers and project teams held positive attitudes toward lessons learned. Further, a statistically significant relationship was found between the collection and use of lessons learned and overall project success. The study calls for project management to embrace lessons learned as a way of realizing positive project management outcomes.

Brandon (2019) examined whether organizations benefited from lessons learned from project implementation and whether they were documented as best practices and utilized by project teams. Using a correlational analysis, the study measured the use of lessons learned and overall project success. The findings from the analysis showed that the use of lessons learned had a high correlation with greater project success. The study calls for project management practitioners to embrace the use of lessons learned to strengthen project management theory and practice.

El Khatib et al. (2021) investigated lessons learned and knowledge management within an oil company in the United Arab Emirates. The study used interviews with project managers from the oil company to assess their understanding of lessons learned and knowledge management. The findings of the study showed that when project teams embrace learning from project management activities including monitoring and evaluation, there is increased buy-in from management and leadership, a better knowledge management culture and a high likelihood that lessons learned will be used to improve current and future project implementation. When project teams understand that learning is part of project management, they are more likely to embrace its activities including project monitoring and evaluation.

Eken et al. (2020) assessed the use of lessons learned by organizations and whether organizational environments facilitated learning from project activities. The study established that when used during project management, lessons learned can contribute to improving overall project implementation and encourage organizational learning for project teams. This leads to better project management for current and future M&E activities. In a different study, Weber et al. (2018) investigated how programmatic monitoring and evaluation allow for collaborative learning among project teams. The study found that M&E promotes collaborative learning and adaptation among various project teams and stakeholders leading to improved project implementation outcomes.

2.3 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)

Participation is a popular approach to the M & E process through which stakeholders are engaged at different stages. It allows various stakeholders to do self-assessments, generate and share knowledge, suggest corrective actions, collaboratively gather and synthesize data, and take any corrective actions (Sartorius, 2018). It involves external and internal stakeholders who share knowledge and develop joint ownership between donors, implementors and programme or project evaluators (Guo & Kapucu, 2019). PME engages project stakeholders in a way that enables them to reflect and assess the level of progress made in a project or programme, and whether or not intended results are being achieved (Tengan & Aigbavboa, 2017). The overarching benefit of PME over other approaches is its ability to bring project or programme beneficiaries closer to project outcomes and empowers stakeholders by ensuring they participate and share in the evaluation results (Kusters et al., 2018). It also encourages learning because feedback is shared among stakeholders in a particular programme or project. As a result, it strengthens ownership, accountability, and information sharing among different stakeholders, improving the overall monitoring and evaluation process. PME also builds capacity, creates teams, and better collaboration among stakeholders on why monitoring and evaluation matters (Boss & Wanyoike, 2018).

2.4 M&E as a Learning Tool

Monitoring and evaluation should be used as a learning process rather than the common approach of accounting for results achieved by projects or programmes. M & E needs to focus more on collecting negative and positive feedback or experiences as a platform for learning and accountability and promoting change from programmatic interventions (Kabonga, 2020). Scotland's International Development Alliance (SIDA, 2015) cautions that the learning part of M & E often has the highest risk of being forgotten or overlooked and calls for learning as a good practice where positive or negative results are shared with various stakeholders. According to Khalayleh (2021), M & E processes become relevant when the findings and results lead to learning and knowledge sharing during and after a programme or project. The process should allow feedback sharing and facilitate learning. This is in sharp contrast to some of the outcomes of evaluations where stakeholders feel that the evaluation process may be used to curtail their freedoms and negatively affect their jobs including their self-esteem. OECD (2011) points out that

lessons learnt in monitoring and evaluation can be used to make programmes more effective and impactful in the present and future. Further, the theory of social learning discussed earlier underscores the importance of using M & E as a learning tool. Neumann et al. (2018) calls on senior management to be ready and willing to evaluate in the first place.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Location of the Study

The study was conducted in Machakos County in Kenya, which has eight constituencies: Mwala, Kathiani, Mavoko, Kangundo, Masinga, Machakos Town, Matungulu and Yatta.

3.2 Research Design

A descriptive research design was used and this allowed use of both quantitative and qualitative. This research design enabled the researcher to get the correct procedures that are to be followed to attain results that are efficient, valid, and accurate (Huntington-Klein, 2021). This particular design allowed the researcher to give a more holistic view of the subject matter that was being investigated.

3.3 Target Population

Programme staff implementing donor-funded projects in Machakos County, Kenya was the target population. Specifically, these included staff implementing projects or programmes focused on three thematic areas: Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH), Livelihood, and Health donor-funded projects which are the dominant donor-funded development projects.

3.4 Sampling Technique and Procedure

The study did a census and therefore the entire target population was the sample size that was used for the survey. Purposive sampling was used to select the participants for key informant interviews. Purposive sampling was chosen for this study because it allowed the researcher to select participants who had the required information.

3.5 Sample Size

The study did a census and therefore the entire target population (102 participants) was the sample size that was used for the survey. The study used purposive sampling to select 30 key informants (29.4% of target population) for key informant interviews. This sample size was expected to enable the researcher to meet the data saturation point. A summary of the sample size is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Survey Sample Size

Thematic Area	Sample Size (n)
WASH	45
Livelihood	27
Health	30
Total	102

3.6 Data Collection Techniques and Analysis

Primary data sources used were key informant interviews and questionnaires with identified key personnel from development projects in Machakos County. Secondary data was collected through a desk review of project documentation, other relevant documentation, and published/complied reports that addressed the subject matter of the study. Qualitative data was analyzed using thematic data analysis which involved the identification of recurring patterns (Lochmiller, 2021). Descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviations were used to analyze quantitative data.

IV. RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Biographic Information of Respondents

The response rate from the survey was 89% which represented 91 respondents out of the 102-project staff who were surveyed. A total of 55% of the respondents were male while 45% of the respondents were female. There was a fair gender representation among the study's survey respondents.



A total of 48% of the respondents had Bachelor’s Degrees, with 21% having post-graduate qualifications. 25% of the respondents had college/tertiary education levels and only 6% had secondary school education levels. A summary of the results of the demographic distribution is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Age of Respondents

Age Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
<25 years	4	4
26-35 years	11	12
36-45 years	43	48
46-55 years	25	27
Above 55 years	8	9
Total	91	100

The level of work experiences among the participants of the study was evaluated by the study and a summary of the results is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3
Work Experiences in Years

Work Experience in Years	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
<3 years	9	10
3-6 years	30	33
More than 6 years	52	57
Total	91	100

A majority of the research participants had commendable experiences and knowledge on monitoring and evaluation. These levels of experience improved the accuracy of the information they provided during the study and this improved the overall quality of the results from the study since they provided a broad range of insights and perspectives of the phenomenon that was under investigation.

4.2 Influence of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

A thorough assessment of stakeholder participation in project design and implementation was done and the results are summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Influence of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Participatory M&E Practices	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD
Involvement of all relevant project stakeholders during the preliminary stages of project design strengthens M&E	91	8 (8.79%)	13 (14.29%)	17 (18.68%)	32 (35.16%)	21 (23.08%)	3.49	1.13
Relevant stakeholders need to be a part of project M&E activities	91	9 (9.89%)	11 (12.09%)	14 (15.38%)	39 (42.86%)	18 (19.78%)	3.51	1.27
Feedback from various stakeholders is incorporated and used to strengthen the delivery of various project activities	91	6 (6.59%)	13 (14.29%)	19 (20.88%)	41 (45.05%)	12 (13.19%)	3.44	1.43
The ability to monitor projects is enhanced among stakeholders because they are involved in design and implementation activities	91	10 (10.99%)	8 (8.79%)	14 (15.38%)	33 (36.26%)	26 (28.57%)	3.62	1.44
Project planning reflects the various community needs and it supports decision-making processes during project implementation	91	11 (12.09%)	16 (17.58%)	19 (20.88%)	27 (29.67%)	18 (19.78%)	3.27	1.72
Communication strategies address information flow among various stakeholders	91	8 (8.79%)	12 (13.19%)	17 (18.68%)	31 (34.07%)	23 (25.27%)	3.54	1.59
Composite Mean							3.48	1.43



As summarized in Table 4, a majority of the respondents emphasized that it was important to ensure everyone was brought on board during project implementation since it led to improved M &E. Previous work by Karimi et al. (2021) identified involvement of stakeholders in projects as a way of strengthening both implementation and M & E. Further, Kusters et al. (2018) emphasized on PME and stakeholder involvement over other approaches to M & E. This is because it brought project beneficiaries to planned outcomes and empowered various stakeholders through including them in design and implementation. Further, Mwanzia (2019) asserted that PME goes beyond simply measuring how effective a programme or project is, but instead brings in different categories of stakeholders, empowers them, encourages more accountability, and ensures that corrective action is taken on time to improve programme performance and planned outcomes. The use of stakeholder feedback and its incorporation into project implementation was rated as one of the approaches to strengthen project M&E activities. Boss and Wanyoike (2018) emphasize that when feedback is shared among stakeholders in a particular programme or project it strengthens ownership, accountability, and information sharing among different stakeholders, improving the overall monitoring and evaluation process.

The findings from the survey tool were supported by qualitative data analysis from one-on-one interviews with key informants on the influence of a participatory monitoring and evaluation approach. This was reported in a key informant interview who noted that:

Various parties have to be on board from inception. You do not want to implement a project where parties feel left out. To have a successful M&E, all relevant stakeholders have to be part of it and this directly influences both the level of success in terms of project implementation as well as its monitoring and evaluation (Key Informant)

This response was supported by a different KII who expressed the important role of stakeholder engagement in project M & E.

During the commencement of a project or programme, we try to get various stakeholders together into a meeting just to let everyone know what is happening. This creates ownership of the project from its beginning which in most cases positively influences project implementation (Key Informant)

Participants revealed getting various stakeholders to participate in project design and implementation strengthened their abilities to monitor and evaluate projects since they had an in-depth understanding of a project. This finding was supported by an interviewee who observed:

Through allowing participants to be involved, you create more ownership of the project from the beginning and this improves implementation and monitoring and evaluation outcomes” (Key Informant)

4.3 M&E as a Learning Tool

Participants were asked to rate the role of M & E as a learning tool in development projects. A summary of the analysis from the questionnaire rating is presented in Table 5 which shows the calculated means for the various assessment statements under this objective.

Table 5
M&E as a Learning Tool

M & E as a Learning Tool	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD
Learning is integral to ensuring M & E is effective and project teams can learn immensely from M & E	91	5 (5.49%)	8 (8.79%)	12 (13.19%)	37 (40.66%)	29 (31.87%)	3.84	1.15
Project teams regularly use M&E for learning purposes	91	3 (3.30%)	7 (7.69%)	15 (16.48%)	42 (46.15%)	24 (26.37%)	3.84	1.37
Views and perspectives held by different project team members are respected and taken into consideration	91	8 (8.79%)	12 (13.19%)	16 (17.58%)	34 (37.36%)	21 (23.08%)	3.52	1.43
Project teams view M&E as a necessity and are eager to participate in the process	91	6 (6.59%)	11 (12.09%)	14 (15.38%)	43 (47.25%)	17 (18.68%)	3.59	1.71
Findings from M&E are not used for disciplinary measures against project staff	91	4 (4.40%)	9 (9.89%)	13 (14.29%)	44 (48.35%)	21 (23.08%)	3.75	1.83
There is little resistance to M&E among project team members	91	7 (7.69%)	11 (12.09%)	16 (17.58%)	32 (35.16%)	25 (27.47%)	3.62	1.29
Composite Mean							3.69	1.46

As indicated in Table 5 above, a majority (72%) of the survey respondents indicated that learning is integral to ensuring M & E is effective and project teams can learn immensely from M & E, while 13% of the survey respondents were neutral on this statement. This finding concurs with Khalayleh (2021) who reports that M&E processes become relevant when the findings and results lead to learning and knowledge sharing during and after a programme or project. The learning acquired from M&E should therefore provide feedback into the programme cycle and be availed to relevant programme stakeholders for it to become applied knowledge. Epp and Garside (2014) support this argument and note that through social learning approaches, it is possible to create shared learning experiences, particularly among major stakeholders that are involved in a particular programme or project.

The study assessed whether views and perspectives held by different project team members are respected and taken into consideration during project implementation. A total of 60% of the survey respondents agreed with this statement. This underscored the important role of ensuring that varying perspectives of project team members and stakeholders are given due consideration during project implementation. Boss & Wanyoike (2018), note that when feedback is shared among stakeholders in a particular programme or project it strengthens ownership, accountability, and information sharing among different stakeholders, improving the overall monitoring and evaluation process. Thus, programme and project management often need effective M & E tools that support implementation and provide timely feedback. Further, Kabonga (2020) emphasizes that project M&E needs to focus more on collecting both negative and positive feedback or experiences as a platform for learning, accountability, and promoting change from programmatic interventions.

The above findings were supported by one-on-one interviews with project managers which brought to light the different perspectives held when it came to the use of M & E as a learning tool during and after project implementation. A majority of the interviewed key informants observed that learning is integral to ensuring M & E is effective and project teams can learn immensely from M & E. This finding is supported by interviewed project managers who stated that;

Monitoring and evaluation can be a learning tool if the views and perspectives held by different project team members are respected and taken into consideration. I always try to ensure that even when obvious mistakes are made, we use it as a learning tool rather than a disciplinary tool. My project team members thus know, that no one will victimize them for ideas and suggestions made (Key Informant)

This was supported by a different interviewee who observed that;

During regular meetings or workshops, everyone should learn from the monitoring and evaluation of the project. It is not a forum to identify who is wrong or right, but rather, what we can all learn from the implementation of a given project. This improves implementation of future programmes because of the valuable lessons learned shared among project teams (Key Informant).

V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the study concluded that getting various stakeholders to participate in project design and implementation strengthened their abilities to monitor and evaluate projects since they had an in-depth understanding of a project. Project teams can learn from M & E rather than it being a means to sort of punish individuals. Project managers must enlighten teams that the purpose of carrying out our M & E is to encourage learning and use the evidence from the findings to strengthen programming and ensure accountability rather than to institute disciplinary processes.

5.2 Recommendations

The study made the following recommendations. Project managers need to involve relevant parties in a project since this influences its implementation and M & E among donor-funded development projects. Project managers must enlighten teams that the purpose of carrying out M & E is to encourage learning and use the evidence from the findings to strengthen programming and ensure accountability rather than to institute disciplinary processes. Project managers need to put in place incentives for project teams to learn not just for reporting to funding agencies but for the benefit of internal learning among project teams.

REFERENCES

- Akanbang, B., & Abdallah, A. I. (2021). Participatory monitoring and evaluation in local government: A case study of Lambussie District, Ghana. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, 25, 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.5130/cjlg.vi25.8037>

- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social Learning Theory*. General Learning Press.
- Boaz, A., Hanney, S., Borst, R., O'Shea, A., & Kok, M. (2018). How to engage stakeholders in research: Design principles to support improvement. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 16(1), 1-9.
- Boss, E. K., & Wanyoike, D. (2018). Effects of user perceptions and budgetary allocation on the adoption of information communication technology in participatory monitoring and evaluation of government-funded projects in Baringo County. *International Journal of Business Management and Processes*, 4(2), 10-10.
- Brandon, T. P. (2019). *Do project organizations learn from lessons learned?* (Master's dissertation, Northcentral University).
- Eken, G., Bilgin, G., Dikmen, I., & Birgonul, M. T. (2020). A lessons-learned tool for organizational learning in construction. *Automation in Construction*, 110, 102977.
- El Khatib, M., Al Jaber, A., & Al Mahri, A. (2021). Benchmarking projects' "lessons learned" through knowledge management systems: Case of an oil company. *iBusiness*, 13, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ib.2021.131001>
- Epp, M. V., & Garside, B. (2014). *Monitoring and evaluating social learning: A framework for cross-initiative application*. CCAFS Working Paper.
- Firmansyah, D., & Saepuloh, D. (2022). Social learning theory: Cognitive and behavioral approaches. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Holistik*, 1(3), 297-324.
- Gayithri, K. (2019). Monitoring and evaluation of government programs in India and Canada. In *Nation-building, education and culture in India and Canada* (pp. 171-185). Springer.
- Guo, X., & Kapucu, N. (2019). Examining stakeholder participation in social stability risk assessment for mega projects using network analysis. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 1(1), 1-31.
- Huntington-Klein, N. (2021). *The effect: An introduction to research design and causality*. CRC Press.
- Iddi, B., & Nuhu, S. (2018). Challenges and opportunities for community participation in monitoring and evaluation of government projects in Tanzania: Case of TASAF II, Bagamoyo District. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Kabonga, I. (2018). Principles and practice of monitoring and evaluation: A paraphernalia for effective development. *Africanus: Journal of Development Studies*, 48(2), 1-21.
- Kananura, R. M., Ekirapa-Kiracho, E., Paina, L., Bumba, A., Mulekwa, G., Nakiganda-Busiku, D., Oo, H. N. L., Kiwanuka, S. N., George, A., & Peters, D. H. (2017). Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence decision-making: Lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 15(2), 55.
- Kanyamuna, V., Katowa, T., Mubita, A., Kanenga, H., Simui, F., & Kotze, D. A. (2020). Analysis of structural and organizational arrangements of monitoring and evaluation status for the public sector in Zambia. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(6), 504-527.
- Karimi, S. S., Mulwa, A. S., & Kyalo, D. N. (2021). Stakeholder capacity building in monitoring and evaluation and performance of literacy and numeracy educational programme in public primary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. *Higher Education Studies*, 11(2), 186-200.
- Khalayleh, A., Baloch, I., Dele-Ajayi, O., & Kaye, T. (2021). A monitoring and evaluation framework for blended learning: Pakistan Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. [Working Paper]. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4633326>. Available at <https://docs.edtechhub.org/lib/XBPZPS3P>. Available under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.
- Kusters, K., Buck, L., de Graaf, M., Minang, P., van Oosten, C., & Zagt, R. (2018). Participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation of multi-stakeholder platforms in integrated landscape initiatives. *Environmental Management*, 62(1), 170-181.
- Leariwal, L. J. (2021). Participatory monitoring and evaluation practices and performance of selected national government constituency development fund projects in Samburu County, Kenya. (Master's Thesis: Kenyatta University).
- Lee, G. Y., Hickie, I. B., Occhipinti, J. A., Song, Y. J. C., Skinner, A., Camacho, S., Lawson, K., Hilber, A. M., & Freebairn, L. (2022). Presenting a comprehensive multi-scale evaluation framework for participatory modelling programs: A scoping review. *PloS one*, 17(4), e0266125. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0266125>
- Linfield, J. K., & Posavac, E. J. (2018). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies* (9th ed.). Routledge.
- Lochmiller, C. R. (2021). Conducting thematic analysis with qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report*, 26(6), 2029-2044.
- Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2018). *Program evaluation theory and practice*. Guilford Publications.

- Musyoka, L. (2020). *An analysis of the perceptions of monitoring and evaluation as a tool for measuring the effectiveness of project implementation: A case of Kenya National Highway Authority* (Master's dissertation, Daystar University, School of Human and Social Sciences).
- Mwanzia, E. K. (2019). *Influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of donor funded food security projects in Kenya: A case of Kibwezi West Sub-county in Makueni County* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Neumann, J., Robson, A., & Sloan, D. (2018). Monitoring and evaluation of strategic change programme implementation—Lessons from a case analysis. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 66, 120-132.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2011). *The OECD DAC handbook on security system reform supporting security and justice*. OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264027862-en>
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2022). *Evaluation criteria*. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>
- Purdue, S., Peterson, H., & Deng, C. (2018). The case for greater youth participation in monitoring and evaluation in international development. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 18(4), 206-221.
- Sartorius, R. (2018). Building local capacity for participatory monitoring and evaluation. In *Evaluation and poverty reduction* (pp. 133-143). Routledge.
- SIDA. (2023). *Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) guide: Using MEL to strengthen your organisational effectiveness*. Scotland's International Development Alliance. https://intdevalliance.scot/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/MEL_Support_Package_4th_June.pdf
- Soto, R. L., de Vente, J., & Padilla, M. C. (2021). Learning from farmers' experiences with participatory monitoring and evaluation of regenerative agriculture based on visual soil assessment. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 88, 192-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.10.017>
- Sulemana, M., Musah, A. B., & Simon, K. K. (2018). An assessment of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation of district assembly projects and programmes in the Savelugu-Nanton Municipality Assembly, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 15(1), 173-195.
- Tengan, C., & Aigbavboa, C. (2021). Validating factors influencing monitoring and evaluation in the Ghanaian construction industry: A Delphi study approach. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 21(3), 223-234.
- Therese, I. M., Gamariel, N., & Placide, M. (2022). The relationship between monitoring, evaluation methods, and the achievement of a Rwandan agricultural project: A case of radical terraces funded by USAID-HINGA WEZE project in Nyabihu District (2018-2020). *International Journal of Natural Sciences: Current and Future Research Trends*, 13(1), 22-29.
- Turner, J. R. (2022). *The handbook of project-based management*. Prentice Hall.
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework. (2014). *Theory of change: UNDAF companion guide*. UNDAF. Available at <https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/UNDG-UNDAF-Companion-Pieces-7-Theory-of-Change.pdf>
- Weber, C., Åberg, U., Buijse, A. D., Hughes, F. M. R., McKie, B. G., Piégay, H., Roni, P., Vollenweider, S., & Haertel-Borer, S. (2018). Goals and principles for programmatic river restoration monitoring and evaluation: Collaborative learning across multiple projects. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, 5(1), e1257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1257>
- Weiss, C. H. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. In *New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Concepts, methods, and contexts* (Vol. 1, pp. 65-92).
- Weiss, C. H. (1972). *Evaluation research: Methods of assessing program effectiveness*. Prentice-Hall.
- Witkowski, S. (2020). *An examination of stakeholder perceptions in conventional and participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental management* (Master's dissertation, Brock University).
- Wyrozobski, P., & Pawlak, R. (2021). The role and meaning of lessons learned in project knowledge management in organizations in Poland. *Procedia Computer Science*, 192, 2396-2405.
- Zare, F., Guillaume, J., Elsayah, S., Croke, B., Fu, B., Iwanaga, T., Merritt, W., Partington, D., Ticehurst, J., & Jakeman, A. J. (2021). A formative and self-reflective approach to monitoring and evaluation of interdisciplinary team research: An integrated water resource modelling application in Australia. *Journal of Hydrology*, 596, 126070. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126070>