

# Influence Of Monitoring And Evaluation Systems On The Performance Of Projects In Non-Governmental Organizations: A Case Of Development Projects In Gitega, Burundi.

Bigirimana Jonas

School of Social Sciences  
Mt. Kenya University College, Kenya

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.14.06.2024.p15040

Paper Received Date: 16th June 2024  
Paper Acceptance Date: 20th June 2024  
Paper Publication Date: 26th June 2024

**Abstract-** The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation Systems on the performance of projects in non-governmental organizations: a case of development projects in Gitega, Burundi. It is built around the following objectives: (1) to assess how organizational structures for monitoring and evaluation influence on performance of non-governmental organizations; (2) to determine how human capacity for monitoring and evaluation influence performance of non-governmental organizations; (3) to examine the influence that project monitoring and evaluation plan has on performance of projects in non-governmental organizations; (4) to establish how a costed work plan for monitoring and evaluation influences performance of projects in non-governmental organizations. The researcher used Yamane (1967)'s formula to determine the sample of 11NGOs of 16 and 55 respondents for the population of around 555 to get primary data to supplement secondary data using a questionnaire and interview. The data collected from the sampled 55 respondents from 11 NGOS operating in Gitega development projects was downloaded from Kobo collect or collected on sheets of paper and translated to excel and SPSS for further processing. The study concluded that monitoring and evaluation systems have a significant and fundamental role in influencing the performance of the of projects in non-governmental organizations in Gitega, Burundi.

**Index Terms-** Monitoring, Evaluation, Non-governmental organizations, development projects, performance, work plan

## I. INTRODUCTION

Burundi has registered many associations following the conflicts that occurred in the past. Sebudandi et al. (2001) pointed out that in 2001, Burundi had above 1400 civil societies, and every year, hundreds more were registered. To bring out a better understanding on the issue of civil societies, Sebudandi and Nduwayo grouped these societies in 15 classes as they were in 2001. The biggest and most significant of them all at 22.16% in the Burundi society was a category of self-development and

economic development. Secondly, another relatively vital group was the religious group at 10%, solidarity organizations and societies that assist the highly marginalized; another group was under training and research organizations represented by 1percent of the entire civil association group but are not thus less significant such as organizations of civil rights, sports and culture organizations, humanitarian groups, special interest associations, human rights groups, environment associations, and non-classified organizations. The global non-governmental organizations are money wise limited but psychologically integral in the world community, and their presence and programs must leave a significant impact on volatile regions. Havermans (2000) sees a more significant influence of the projects of International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and maintains that these organizations can bring change. However, Nduwayo (2003) stated that civil societies in Burundi are emerging but their impact is not visible. Thus, the need for monitoring and evaluation.

World Bank (2005) defined monitoring as systematic and persistent information gathering from programs and projects for four major reasons. One, to get insights learnt previous occurrences and enhance future tasks and practices, to get accountability for used resources internally and externally and outcomes acquired (Ben, 2002. Third, to make logical decisions on the upcoming initiatives and to encourage the beneficiaries' empowerment (John et al., 2008). On the other hand, (Yang et al. ,2008), defined evaluation as systematically and objectively assessing a finished program/project (or a section of a progressing program) and its objective is to appraise information and data that guide making of strategic decisions, hence, bettering the program/project in the long run. In addition, from the perspective of Pfohl (2006), evaluation process must assist to make inferences concerning five intervention elements which are; efficiency, performance, sustainability, relevance and impact. In non-governmental organizations, the process of monitoring and evaluation are very critical. These practices bring the positioning with modalities, for institutional learning, and even guarantee effectiveness.

In East Africa where Burundi is located, M&E framework in South Sudan has various group of players with various power connections among them (CARE International (2012). In this case, there was Inconsistency social connections and levels either between stakeholders that is local community, NGOs, facilitators and financiers or at various organizational classes such a program, policy and project. According to CARE International (2012), if one disregarded the problem of unbalanced power connections, the real participation process may not happen at all. M&E model retrogressed into a practice managed by the mighty for example, financiers and NGOs were authentic stakeholders to the results of practice of M&E. The ownership and knowledge control and application may be crucial, who managed and affected M&E procedure, a lot of openness between the financiers and the financed was needed in consultations as to which basis were to identify progress and change where M&E model supported non-governmental organizations performance (CARE International, 2012).

Locally, Burundi systems of monitoring and evaluation are used to evaluate success and impact of the project.; we give an example of the evaluation of “Capacity building and project sustainability in Ngozi Province, Burundi” conducted by Ndayizeye (2018); it revealed that capacity requires evaluation, public engagement in the decision making and planning processes, management and personal abilities are our key critical components needed in the agribusiness programs sustainability in Ngozi province. Again, in Burundi’s Comprehensive, integrated watershed and swamp management project, evaluation report shows that project success was influenced by direct participation of local society and partners in rural development projects (Koyo, 2004). Monitoring and Evaluation made for Peace Operations projects in Afghanistan, Burundi, and Liberia indicate that individuals that support formulation of M& methods also need to participate in their implementation, hence assisting to alleviate looming analytical and methodological misconception in execution stage (Cedric, 2009).

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In Gitega, Province, Non-government organizations implementing projects encounter many problems. Local government organizations complain about their accountability and impacts of the huge interventions in different sectors (Education, Health, food security, economic empowerments, social cohesion, etc). This is added to the lack of understanding of implementers of how to monitor and evaluate the impact of their interventions which is broad, holistic and specific to each NGO’s approach. The M&E systems make it possible for the organizations to track progress towards results at output and impact/outcome level and inform capacity building interventions, designs of future interventions, etc.

The Global Climate report (2022) states that NGO effectiveness is often questioned. Again, this is an issue of accountability with which NGOs grapple; the report addresses this by Thomas Carroll’s definition as an industry standard for the evaluation of NGO Project performance. M&E systems suffers from multiple weaknesses in most NGOs operating in Burundi, we

can cite major results by Search for Common Ground from an assessment of a project on the enhancement of egalitarian leadership in Burundi (2006-2008) presenting considerable M&E gaps mainly on design of the project which had procedural weaknesses since there was comparative difficulty subject matter propagated and inadequate interventions by major stakeholders to address the issue, the M&E attempts additionally experienced problem of gap in gathering and data management and the determination of specific project(planning) results, and finally the clustering of tasks carried out on every program in the same report, caused difficulties in separating effects of an individual project (Search for Common Ground Report, 2008).

Moreover, a study enhancement and intensifying the innovations of fodder shrub adoption in East Africa, by Charles et al. (2011) found out that inadequate monitoring and evaluation systems is one of constraints and challenges encountered in development projects. Important to know; limited studies have been devoted to the evaluation of the influence of M&E systems with a variety of elements on the performance of development projects by Non-Governmental Organizations in Burundi.

Again, there are complaints from government and other stakeholders that despite the presence of great number of international organizations operating in development sector in Gitega, Burundi, little progress, impact, change is seen either at community level, at the national level and at organizational level. Research have distinguished programs done by NGOs in developing nations by extreme flop rates and non-pleasant performance (Golini et all. 2015). Specialists and scholars of project management have thought of adopting innovative practices of managing projects that is expanding and seen as an instrument for successful project management. Projects for NGOs are peculiar in their design and objective and it is stipulated that embracing of M&E practices differs accordingly (Sharpiro 2011).

Development projects open and close in Gitega, Burundi, but less lessons learnt are shared to feed future projects, and yet there are budgets allocated to monitoring and evaluation. Therefore, the present study will fill the gaps by attempting to find solutions by assessing which/how M&E systems components can contribute to the performance of development projects implemented by NGOs, Burundi, and then contribute to removing Burundi from poor and vulnerable countries list.

## OBJECTIVES

1. To assess how organizational structure for M&E influences the performance of projects in NGOs in Gitega Province.
2. To determine how human capacity for M&E influences development projects in NGOs in Gitega Province.
3. To examine the influence that project monitoring and evaluation plan has on performance of development projects in non-governmental organizations in Gitega Province
4. To establish how a costed work plan for monitoring and evaluation influence performance of projects in NGOs, in Gitega Province, Burundi.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### **Organizational Structure for Monitoring and Evaluation and performance of development projects**

Organizational structure for M & E results to better performance of development programs. According to Miles et al. (1978), an institution is both established procedure and purpose to attain the objective: that is the organizational concept is adopting both objectives and entire component that show unique combination. There are many different organizational structure configurations. A study by Mintzberg (1980) divided organizational structure into five distinguished arrangements; the first structure is a simple one, which is usually small or young basic institution which have loose division of labor, small mid management level, a casual process of decision making, and the power centralization which permits quick feedback. Moreover, small of the behavior of the organization is regularized, thus minimally using planning, training and liaison gadgets. The second order is bureaucracy, which marked by rationalized power with a regularized decision-making process with greater and regularized processes with an explicit divide between managers and line workers. Furthermore, formal communication is preferred in the entire stages of machine bureaucratic organization.

The third arrangement is professional bureaucracy which contains greatly particularized jobs and less regularization; the framework is vertically and horizontally centralized and gives room for autonomous environment of work, but maintains the formalized demands applied by a big institution in solid and sophisticated atmosphere. The fourth configuration is in form of divisional units which can be identified by the small vertical decentralization; they are various stand-alone partitions whereby they all report to main branch, thus making mid-management an integral part of an organization.

### **Human Capacity for Monitoring and evaluation**

Görgens et al. (2009) define capacity for M&E in three levels (system, organization, and human) the first one being the capacity of a framework to fulfil objectives and goals of a procedure and thus, take part in attaining objectives of the organization. The same authors define capacity in a context of systems as a group of establishments that function to pursue a mutual goal and as per particular procedures and rules. That is, the capacity is a progressive procedure that manpower is key to development of capacity, and that the entire context within which institutions carry out their operations are major deliberations in capacity development strategies. Stephen et al. (2017), defines capacity as people, organizations and entire society ability to control their events effectively. The same authors add that different people development and capacity building in M&E is schemed and executed frequently for effective M&E work implementation.

The same authors add that capacity building and development of various people involved in M&E is planned and carried out on a regular basis for successful implementation of M&E work, that is with skill and competence of M&E, programs can achieve their anticipated outcomes. In addition, in human capacity planning and assessment, the first stage is to identify M&E available experience with the program/project team. organization's partner, targeted beneficiaries and any other possible actors in the system of monitoring and evaluation; this is because successful M& execution needs that the workers within

the department have required M&E technical knowledge and expertise. Moreover, it is necessary to mention that on equipping of evaluators, it is necessary for them to have both on-job exposure and formal training.

Findings show that the most of the participants agree that there is an oversight, coaching and training for M&E esteemed individuals, on funds allocation for capacity building, internal and external program workers get need-driven coaching on gaps of monitoring and evaluation. However, the majority of respondents revealed lack of sufficient and knowledgeable employee responsible for guiding M&E tasks within projects and mentioned there is no periodical evaluation of the need for capacity building. The present study will attempt to find out whether organisations have improved adequate and skilled employees in projects and whether there is a periodical evaluation of the need for capacity building on M&E skills.

### **Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and performance of NGO Projects**

Elizabeth (2018) defined planning as the process of reflecting and arranging tasks needed to pursue an aimed goal and it is one of the majorly crucial managements of project/program and techniques of managing time. Thinking about and organizing the activities required to achieve a desired goal and is one of the most important program/project management and time management techniques. This means that a successful program or project is one that has a clear plan; it involves making a sequence of actions ready to achieve set goals, objectives, targets and milestones; it helps to clarify to colleague and wider stakeholders the intention of a program and where it is headed.

NSW (2015) defines plan of monitoring and evaluation as an instrument to assist in keeping a project on track, to adopt if needed and in the end to help the organization in pursuing its project results. Moreover, evaluation offers a response method for progressive enhancement of organizational effort; it must influence making of decision at each phase of the program and stir up organization to consider the results which influence the upcoming actions. Hypothetically, evaluation begins from the time the project is designed and continues throughout to the end of the program. Hence, monitoring a project refers to the checking if the expected levels of performance is being attained as stipulated in the objectives of the project and anticipated results at regular intervals.

Elizabeth (2018), goes in the same way by exploring that an M&E scheme is a simple document that is gives a blueprint on the manner monitoring and evaluation will be carried out in the entire project and displays the manner in which anticipated outcomes of a project link to its objectives and goals; explains the information required and how this information will be gathered and interpreted and how this data will be applied; it is mentions the resources that will be required for the plan implementation; and the project will be responsible for stakeholders, she also states that monitoring and evaluation is plan is established at the initiation phase of the program or a strategic framework, and establishment of the M&E plan is a significant stage to control the process of evaluating and reporting progress towards attaining project results and outputs, and determine what the evaluation questions will be handled. Finally, Elizabeth (2018) leads us to the real fact that planning is the foundation on which monitoring and evaluation of programs

and projects is based; it is done to track the implementation of the plan. More specifically, during monitoring we are asking two key questions: (1) are we doing things right (are we expending resources and implementing the activities in accordance with the plan)? (2) Are we doing the right things (is what we are doing likely to get us to the objectives and goals that were set in the plan)? To monitor and evaluate we need clearly defined goals, objectives, activities, time-frames, etc. More broadly, high-quality, well-timed M&E can aid planning across various different management functions in the education sector.

### **Cost Work Plan**

Görgens et al. (2009) defines an M&E work plan as a task-based budget displaying activities, duties, expenses and time period. They recommend that an institution should scheme a work plan with its expenditure that documents and budget allocations for the entire monitoring and evaluation tasks; it can be a multi sectoral, multiyear or multi-level.

Elizabeth (2018) suggests a one-year cost planning and defines an M&E work plan as a yearly budgeted M&E plan that identifies priority activities of M&E for that year and the organizational and personal duties and roles for their execution; each activity cost and the financing described; a deadline for output/products delivery. The action plan is applied for organizing monitoring and evaluation duties and measuring the development of implementation of M&E annually.

The M&E costed plan is a section that outlines the budget required to implement the M&E Plan, including cost drivers such as survey and census design and administration, data storage costs including software and hardware requirements, costs associated with carrying out evaluations whether outsourced or internal to the organization, M&E dissemination costs as well as the training and development needs for staff to perform M&E duties (Elizabeth, 2018).

The budget section is an enumerated breakdown of possible disbursements/income and costs for a stipulated time that gives a solid, orderly, and simply comprehended summary of how much finances of an organization have been trickling and modalities of spending it; it is a crucial instrument to assist organizations in prioritizing utilization and management of funds. Budgeting involves planning to use organizational resources; and a budget is a quantifying scheme applied as an instrument for identifying tasks that will be selected for a coming time frame (Elizabeth, 2018).

According to Elizabeth (2018), planning and monitoring organizational budget will assist in identifying uneconomical costs, quick adoption as the money circumstances changes, and attain institutional monetary and operational objectives. Hence, periodical expenditure monitoring transforming situations or patterns that require to be corrected and to check whether expenditure is meeting or in line with meeting organizational goals. Organizations should have policies existing within department of M&E to supervise development of the project compared to set objectives and budgets at periodical intervals, such as monthly, with proper mechanisms of reporting.

### **Organizational performance**

Samsonowa (2012) defined performance as the level of goal achievement by an organization. Organizational performance can

be measured by the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and quality of the intervention (Ghalem et al., 2016).

Poister (2003) defined measurement of performance as a procedure of identification, supervising and using various measures of objective of organizational performance and its project on orderly manner. Additionally, Lindblad (2006) argued that defined performance evaluation as the objectives' utilization, indicator, and information to measure non-governmental services and involvements. While Ferreira & Otley (2009) see performance measurement as a system of individuals, teams and entire firm assessment, Miller (2007) saw it as a method of assessing program that measures program effectiveness and efficiency in addition to its effects. And Carman (2007) postulated that measurement of performance, is an orderly assessment of inputs, impacts and outputs of the program.

Njiiri (2015) has put together those definitions to come out with a collective definition that measurement of performance is a technique of identification, control and utilization various assessments organizational performance and its project on systematic grounds. It can be objectives, indicators and information application to evaluate NGOs involvement and services. He additionally states that the NGOs working setting is risky and dynamic and the entire success of these institutions needs fulfilling different stakeholder's demands by establishing reasonable management and measurement of performance systems. Additionally, non-governmental institutions are necessitated to measure and control their performance from different points of view, putting in consideration of performance of the projects/programs, donors' agenda, the beneficiaries' needs and internal success.

World Health Organization (2012) postulated that one of the key practical processes in improvement of attaining goal and performance of NGOs is supervising the development of stipulated goals and evaluating the results of engagements. Therefore, M&E is an aspect resulting to the effectiveness of a program; the success of NGOs operations is as a result of success of schemed project targets.



## Conceptual framework

### Independent variables

#### M&E Systems Components

##### Organizational structure:

- Clear Job description for M&E workforce
- M&E leadership
- Incentives & commitments for M&E
- Integration of M&E into project
- M&E roles in other thecnical staff JDs
- Project mechanisms for M&E

##### Human capacity for M&E:

- Supervision and capacity development
- Budget allocation for Training
- Staff training on M&E
- Adequate capacity for M&E
- M&E needs assessments

##### Project M&E plan:

- Stakeholder participation
- Linked to project plan an Organizational Strategy
- Comprehensiveness
- Steps for M&E strengthening
- Accessibility

##### Costed work plan for M&E:

- Allocation of resources
- Linked to annual or multi-year work plan
- Comprehensiveness
- Participatory in design
- Reviewed periodically

### Dependent Variable

#### NGOs Project performance:

- Project outputs, inputs, and impact (change and transformation)
- Internal effectiveness
- Relevance and quality of intervention (based on beneficiary's needs)
- Project's theory of change

#### Government policy:

- NGOs Cooperation Framework
- National development plan
- National Education policy and strategy

### Intervening variable

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study design employed a mixed methods approach. The study started with literature review as foundation to the study, followed by a structured questionnaire and then key informant interview. It inquired the of influence of monitoring and evaluation systems of the project performance in NGOs. The key informant interviews were used to collect qualitative data on the mentioned topic while the structured questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data on the same topic. The study targeted the 11 NGOs which were implementing development projects related to education (2), Wash and health access (2), nutrition, resilience and economic empowerment (3), protection and social cohesion (4). The research targeted 11 project managers, 22 D&E officers and 22 other operational technical staffs from these NGOs. The researcher used Yamane (1967)'s formula to determine the targets in NGOs and respondents as well. The researcher sampled 55 respondents from 11 NGOs. Purposive sampling was used by the researcher in choosing these respondents. Simple random sampling which is a probability sampling was also used which ensured that all elements in the sampling frame have an equal chance of being selected. The study used both primary and secondary data collection methods. Primary

data was collected through a structured questionnaire and key informant interviews schedules while secondary data sources included literature from libraries, journals and text books.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Response Rate

A total of 50 questionnaires were dispensed to the respondents. A total of 46 questionnaires were correctly filled while the remaining 4 questionnaires were not returned by the respondents due to various reasons. This is equivalent to 92% credible rate of response.

### Reliability Results

The Cronbach Alpha scores obtained from the variables of the study are as follows: Organizational structure 0.812, Human capacity 0.798, Project monitoring and evaluation plan 0.876, Costed work plan 0.913 and Project performance 0.735. The results of the analysis are in tandem with the Johnson & Turner (2011) who observed that a result of 0.7 is sufficient to show that there is reliability of the data collection tool.

**Table 4.1: Summary of Cronbach’s alpha Reliability Coefficient**

Variables	Number of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha	Remarks
Organizational structure	4	0.812	Accepted
Human capacity	3	0.798	Accepted
Project monitoring and evaluation plan	4	0.876	Accepted
Costed work plan	3	0.913	Accepted
Project performance	4	0.735	Accepted

### Academic Qualifications of the Respondents

The findings on the academic qualifications of the respondents indicated that a majority of the respondents had a bachelor’s degree which is represented by 68% of the respondents. Additionally, 18% of the respondents had a diploma qualification while 4% of the respondents had a master’s degree and above as indicated in table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Education Level of the respondents**

Highest level of education	Frequency	Percent
Diploma	9	18%
Bachelor	34	68%
Master and above	2	4%
Missing	5	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

### Organisational structure for monitoring and evaluation and project performance

**Table 4.3: Organizational Structure**

Statements	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
There is clarity on the role and mandate of M&E staff and it is well outlined in their job descriptions.	23	12	4	7	3	3.92	1.304
There is effective leadership for M&E within the project (M&E focal points, M&E units or M&E professional)	13	19	7	8	2	3.67	1.162
There are incentives and the commitment from the management to ensure M&E system performance.	14	19	4	10	2	3.67	1.214
Monitoring and Evaluation activities are integrated into Project planning	16	12	17	2	2	3.69	.947
Monitoring and Evaluation activities are integrated into project implementation	22	17	4	5	1	4.10	1.065
The responsibilities for Monitoring and Evaluation are included in job description of staff implementing projects	19	18	4	7	2	3.66	1.175
There are mechanisms within the project for M&E planning and monitoring the performance of M&E system.	11	19	15	3	1	3.46	1.062
There are mechanisms within the project for stakeholder consultations and monitoring the performance of M&E system.	9	18	7	13	3	3.49	1.101

There are mechanisms within the project for impact monitoring and evaluation after implementations.	17	20	5	7	1	3.75	1.081
---	----	----	---	---	---	------	-------

Monitoring and Evaluation activities are integrated into project implementation had the highest mean of 4.10 and standard deviation of 1.065. This is followed by the statement on clarity on the role and mandate of M&E staff and it is well outlined in their job descriptions that had a mean of 3.92 and the standard deviation. There are mechanisms within the project for impact monitoring and evaluation after implementations had a mean of 3.75 and standard deviation of 1.081. Monitoring and Evaluation activities are integrated into Project planning statement had a mean of 3.69 and a standard deviation of .947. There is effective leadership for M&E within the project (M&E focal points, M&E units or M&E professional) and there are incentives and the commitment from the management to ensure M&E system performance had a mean of 3.67 and standard deviation of 1.162 and 1.214 respectively. The responsibilities for Monitoring and Evaluation are included in job description of staff implementing projects had a mean of 3.66 and standard deviation 1.175. There are mechanisms within the project for stakeholder consultations and monitoring the performance of M&E system had a mean of 3.49 and a standard deviation of 1.101. There are mechanisms within the project for M&E planning and monitoring the performance of M&E system of 3.44 and standard deviation of 1.062. The composite mean of all the statement on organizational structure is 3.72 indicating that there is a general agreement that organizational structure influence the performance of non-government development projects.

### Human capacity for monitoring and evaluation and project performance

**Table 4.4: Human capacity for monitoring and evaluation**

Statements	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
There is supervision, training and coaching for M&E focal points/staff and this role is institutionalized on the organizational organigram	11	17	11	8	2	3.55	1.138
Our projects allocate funds for capacity building (training for projects staff on M&E needs)	11	20	7	10	1	3.61	1.115
Internally and externally projects staffs receive need-based training on M&E gaps	9	19	12	8	1	3.55	1.042
The projects have adequate and skilled employee charged with role of steering M&E activities	18	23	6	3	-	4.12	0.849
Periodically staffs need assessment for M&E are conducted to inform subsequent capacity building programs	9	19	10	11	1	3.48	1.092
There is a periodical/ annual plan for capacity building of M&E staff and other Project staffs	4	18	10	15	-	3.23	1.005
There are mechanisms to follow up the implementation of acquired skills from the periodical organized trained on M&E.	3	20	13	11	-	3.32	0.911
There are mandatory trainings/ courses about monitoring and Evaluation	4	12	10	18	4	2.88	1.142
<b>Composite mean</b>						<b>3.46</b>	

The projects have adequate and skilled employee charged with role of steering M&E activities had a mean of 4.12 and SD of 0.849. This is followed by our projects allocate funds for capacity building (training for projects staff on M&E needs) had a mean of 3.61 and SD of 1.115. Internally and externally projects staffs receive need-based training on M&E gaps had a mean of 3.55 and SD of 1.042. There is supervision, training and coaching for M&E focal points/staff and this role is institutionalized on the organizational organigram had a mean of 3.55 and SD of 1.138. Periodically staffs need assessment for M&E are conducted to inform subsequent capacity building programs had a mean of 3.48 and SD of 1.092. There are mechanisms to follow up the implementation of acquired skills from the periodical organized trained on M&E had a mean of 3.32 and SD of 0.911. There is a periodical/ annual plan for capacity building of M&E staff and other Project staffs had a mean of 3.23 and SD of 1.005. There are mandatory trainings/ courses about monitoring and Evaluation had a mean of 2.88 and SD 1.142. The statement on mandatory training on monitoring and evaluation had the lowest mean of 2.88 compared to the composite mean of 3.46. It is important to have training and courses that will enhance the performance of the employees (Rumenya & Kisimbi, 2020).

### Project monitoring and evaluation plan and project performance

Project stakeholders are involved in design development and review of M&E plan had a mean of 3.49 and a SD of 1.140. M&E plan is linked to overall project plan and organizational strategy had a mean of 3.68 and SD of 1.181. The project M&E plan is comprehensive, that is outlines project goals, strategy, logic models, risks matrix, monitoring plan, dissemination plan had a mean of 3.65 and SD of 1.059. The M&E plan outlines steps for further strengthening of M&E system had a mean of 3.44 and SD of 0.987.

The M&E plan is accessible to project team and field-based staff for reference had a mean of 3.50 and standard deviation of 1.052. The M&E plan is accessible to project stakeholders for reference had a mean of 3.36 and standard deviation 1.031. The M&E plan is accessible to project team and field-based staff for reference had a mean of 3.43 and standard deviation of 1.137. The M&E plan is consistent and contributes to better Project performance and is designed to address the problem identified during Project assessment had a mean of 3.65 and standard deviation of 1.032.

**Table 4.5: Project monitoring and evaluation plan**

Statements	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Project stakeholders are involved in design development and review of M&E plan	7	23	6	8	3	3.49	1.140
M&E plan is linked to overall project plan and organizational strategy	13	19	3	11	1	3.68	1.181
The project M&E plan is comprehensive, that is outlines project goals, strategy, logic models, risks matrix, monitoring plan, dissemination plan	10	19	9	7	1	3.65	1.059
The M&E plan outlines steps for further strengthening of M&E system	6	20	11	11	-	3.44	0.987
The M&E plan is accessible to project team and field-based staff for reference	8	20	8	12	-	3.50	1.052
The M&E plan is accessible to project stakeholders for reference	6	17	13	10	1	3.36	1.031
The M&E plan is accessible to project team and field-based staff for reference	8	18	9	10	2	3.43	1.137
The M&E plan is consistent and contributes to better Project performance and is designed to address the problem identified during Project assessment	10	22	7	10	-	3.65	1.032
Composite mean						3.53	

**Project costed work plan for monitoring and evaluation work plan and project performance and project performance**

**Table 4.6: Project monitoring and evaluation costed work plan**

Statements	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
The M&E work plan contains activities, time frame, activity costs and person responsible for execution of the activity	16	17	7	10	-	3.78	1.112
The M&E work plan is linked to the annual project plan and detailed implementation plan	16	19	6	9	-	3.84	1.076
All project team participated in the development of M&E work plan including the corresponding activity budgets	10	14	12	11	2	3.39	1.169
The M&E work plan is updated annually based on the progress monitoring	11	18	10	10	-	3.61	1.057
Resources both physical, human and financial are committed for the implementation of the M&E work plan	11	23	7	9	-	3.72	1.011
The project monitoring and evaluation work plan is comprehensive for staff and stakeholders	4	18	12	14	-	3.25	0.978
There is a tool for monitoring and evaluation work plan progress tracking.	12	21	5	7	1	3.78	1.073
The monitoring and evaluation work plan is accessible and is linked to project objectives with clear outputs and indicators to access achieved impact or performance.	18	17	4	5	3	3.89	1.220
Composite Mean						3.66	

The first statement was to find out whether M&E work plan contains activities, time frame, activity costs and person responsible for execution of the activity had a mean of 3.78 and SD of 1.112. This implies that majority agreed with the statement. The statement on whether the M&E work plan is linked to the annual project plan and detailed implementation plan had a mean 3.84 and standard deviation of 1.076. The statement on whether all project team participated in the development of M&E work plan including the corresponding activity budgets had a mean of 3.39 and SD of 1.169. The M&E work plan is updated annually based on the progress monitoring had a mean 3.61 and 1.057. Resources both physical, human and financial are committed for the implementation of the M&E work plan had a mean of 3.72 and SD of 1.011. The project monitoring and evaluation work plan is comprehensive for staff and stakeholders had a mean of 3.25 and SD of 0.978. There is a tool for monitoring and evaluation work plan progress tracking had a mean of 3.78 and SD of 1.073. The monitoring and evaluation work plan is accessible and is linked to project objectives with clear outputs



and indicators to access achieved impact or performance had a mean of 3.89 and SD of 1.220. The composite mean was 3.66 indicating that respondents generally agreed that project monitoring and evaluation work plan had a positive impact on the performance of development projects. This is in concurrence with Rumenya & Kisimbi, (2020) who observed that that project monitoring and evaluation work plan are essential in the performance of development projects.

**Correlation Results for performance of development projects in Gitega.**

**Table 4.7: Pearson Moment Correlation Matrix**

Variables	Test	Project Performance	Human Capacity	M&E Plan	Costed work plan	Organizational structure
Project Performance	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
Human Capacity	Pearson Correlation	0.792**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
M & E Plan	Pearson Correlation	.642**	.369**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		
Costed work plan	Pearson Correlation	.707**	.424**	.492**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Organizational Structure	Pearson Correlation	.841**	.308**	.532**	.292**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N		46	46	46	46	46

From the findings in table 4.7 human capacity had a strong positive and significant association with the performance of projects in non-governmental organizations in Gitega ( $r=0.792$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), M & E Plan was also found to have a strong positive and significant relationship with the performance of projects in non-governmental organizations ( $r=0.642$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), additionally Costed work plan also had a strong and positive relationship with project performance in non-governmental organizations in Gitega ( $r=0.707$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). Lastly organizational structure was found to have the strongest positive and significant relationship with project performance in non-governmental organizations in Gitega ( $r=0.841$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). From the findings, it can be deduced that all the variables (Human Capacity M&E Plan, Costed work plan and Organizational Structure) had a significant association with project performance of non-governmental organizations in Gitega.

**Regression Analysis**

**Model Summary**

**Table 4.8: Regression Analysis for organizational structure and Performance of projects in non-governmental organizations.**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.883 <sup>a</sup>	.780	.776		.17342

**a. Predictors: (Constant), organizational structure, human capacity, project M&E plan, costed work plan**

From the findings the performance of non-governmental projects has a linear nexus as shown by the R item value of 0.883. From the table also R square is 0.780 while adjusted R square is 0.776. The explanatory variables (organizational structure, human capacity, project M&E plan, project M&E plan) and dependent variable are fundamentally linked as shown by the correlation coefficient value (R) of 0.883.

Additionally, the findings indicated that R square value was adjudged to be greater than 0.5 showing a significant association between explanatory and response variable. The R2 model which was ascertained to be 0.776 which is equivalent 77.6% of performance of non-governmental projects were brought about by explanatory variables. In conclusion there is a significant relationship between explanatory variables and the performance of projects in non-governmental organizations in Burundi.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the findings of the study, there is a positive and significant impact of M&E systems on the performance of projects by NGOs in Gitega. The study found out that there is clarity on the role and mandate of M&E staff and it is well outlined in their job descriptions. Additionally, the study found out that monitoring and evaluation activities are integrated into project implementation. However, the study found out there are insufficient mechanisms within the project for M&E planning and monitoring the performance of M&E system. The study recommends that non-governmental organization administrators should strive to ensure that personnel with adequate skills and experience are hired to enhance the performance of development projects. Additionally, adequate and relevant trainings, seminars as well as workshops are conducted so as to enhance the capacity and effectiveness of the employees. Non-governmental organizations should institute departments of M&E and ensure that sufficient personnel are in place for proper implementation of M&E functions.

M&E has been identified in the study as one of the components that impact on the performance of the development projects. It is important for organizations to institutionalize M&E by ensuring that M&E unit is established. Costing and budgeting were found to be crucial for the project performance for non-governmental organizations. Cost inferences and proper budgetary measures are vital and play a major role in ensuring the success of development projects for non-governmental organizations. In recommendation, the study infers that budget and cost allotment on monitoring and evaluation systems should be contemplated and regularly appraised to guarantee attainment of the goals of the project.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adelberg, S., & Batson, C. D. (1978). Accountability and helping: When needs exceed resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 343 – 350
- [2] AHMED, Z. U. (2004). Accountability and Control in Non-Governmental – A Case of Bangladesh. Fourth Asia Pacific Interdisciplinary Research in Accounting Conference (pp. 1-25). Manchester: UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.
- [3] Alvi M. (2016). A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research. Munich Personal RePec Archive.
- [4] Ansoff, H. I. 1965. Corporate strategy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [5] Anthony Vance, Paul Benjamin Lowry, and Dennis Eggett (2015). A new approach to the problem of access policy violations: Increasing perceptions of accountability through the user interface, *MIS Quarterly (MISQ)*, vol. 39(2), pp. 345–366.
- [6] Anthony Vance, Paul Benjamin Lowry, and Dennis Eggett (2013). Using accountability to reduce access policy violations in information systems, *Journal of Management Information Systems (JMIS)*, vol. 29(4), pp. 263–289 (doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222290410>)
- [7] Ashar, H., & Sharpiro, J.Z. (1988). Measuring centrality: A Note on Hackmana's Resource-Allocation Theory. *Administrative science*.
- [8] Barr, A., Fafchamps, M., & Owens, T. (2003). Non-Governmental Organizations in Uganda: A report to the Government of Uganda. Centre for the study of African Economies, Oxford University. [https://sarpn.org/documents/d0000716/NGO\\_Uganda\\_Dec2003.pdf](https://sarpn.org/documents/d0000716/NGO_Uganda_Dec2003.pdf)
- [9] Bashir, S. (2019). The Role of NGOs in Community Development in Balochistan. University of Balochistan. DOI: 10.46568/pjass. v4i1.300.
- [10] Ben. M.A. (2002). Community Self-assessment, monitoring and evaluation: Technical support mission report notes. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- [11] Biwott, T., Egesah, O., & Ngeywo, J. (2017). Importance of monitoring and evaluation in the sustainability of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) Projects in Kenya. *International Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 7(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v7.n1.p6>
- [12] Bloisi, W., Cook, C.W., & Hunsaker, P.L. (2007). *Management & Organizational Behaviour*. 2nd edition. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill
- [13] Briceño, B. (2010). Defining the Type of M&E System: Clients, Intended Uses, and Actual Utilization. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/11079>
- [14] Bromiley, P. 1986. Corporate capital investment: A behavioral approach. New York: Cambridge University Press
- [15] Bromideh, A.A. (2011). The Widespread challenges of NGOs in developing countries: case studies from Iran. *International NGO Journal*, 6(9).
- [16] Bower, J. L. 1970. Managing the resource allocation process. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- [17] Caffrey, L., & Munro, E. (2017). A systems approach to policy evaluation. *Evaluation*, 23(4), 463-478.
- [18] Carman, J. (2007). Evaluation practice among community-based organizations: Research into the reality. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(1), pp. 60-75.
- [19] Cedric C. and Paul R. (2009). Monitoring and Evaluation of Peace Operations. International Peace Institute.
- [20] Charles Wambugu, Frank Place & Steven Franzel (2011). Research, development and scaling-up the adoption of fodder shrub innovations in East Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 9:1, 100-109, DOI: 10.3763/ijas.2010.0562
- [21] Chandler, A. D. 1962. Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of American enterprise. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [22] Cheung, S. O., Henry, C. & Kevin K. (2014). PPMS: A Web-based construction Project Performance Monitoring System. *International Journal of Construction*, 13, 361-376.
- [23] Clones House. (2020). How to Create a Structure and Culture for Better Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Plans. Development Consulting and Training Centre.
- [24] Cook, T.D. and Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- [25] Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE 2012), A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation for result based: CARE Programme Juba, South Sudan.
- [26] Cummings, L. L., & Anton, R. J. (1990). The logical and appreciative dimensions of accountability. In S. Sivastva, D. Cooperrider, and Associates (Eds.), *Appreciative management and leadership* (pp. 257 – 286). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- [27] Cristina S. (2012). Resource Allocation in Project Management. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 2012 (October), e-ISSN 2247–7225
- [28] Davies, R. (2001, April 12). Monitoring and Evaluating NGO Achievements. Retrieved from Monitoring and Evaluation NEWS: <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/arnold.htm>
- [29] David, P.E. 1999. SPSS Library: How Negative reliability Coefficients can Occur? Principal Support Statistician and Manager of Statistical Support. SPSS Inc. From SPSS keywords, Number 68, 1999.
- [30] Davis, J. (1997). Towards a Stewardship: Theory of Management. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), pp.20-27.
- [31] DiMaggio, P., (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and collective Rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), pp.147-60.
- [32] Doolen (2003). The impact of organizational context on work team effectiveness: A study of production team. Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA
- [33]
- [34] Douglass, M., Boyd, H., & Gundermann, D. (2003). Nurturing the development of an evaluation culture in public educational agencies. In Annual Conference of the American Evaluation Association, Reno NV.
- [35] Elizabeth, N. (2018). Monitoring and Evaluation in the education sector: a course reader produced as part of a joint MoGE-UNZA capacity building programme. Academia.
- [36] Emelyne, H. and Alex, S. J (2015). Towards understanding participatory processes: Framework, application and results. *Journal of Environmental Management*, Volume 157.

- [37] Emmanuel, Z. N. (2015, May 11). The State of Monitoring and Evaluation of NGOs' Projects in Africa. Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/state-monitoring-evaluation-ngos-projects-africa-yannick-emmanuel>
- [38] Ferreira, A., and Otley, D. (2009). The design and use of performance management systems: An Extended framework for analysis. *Management Accounting Research*, 20(4), pp. 263-282
- [39] Ferris, G. R., Mitchell, T. R., Canavan, P. J., Frink, D. D., & Hopper, H. (1995). *Accountability in human resources systems*.
- [40] Fitzgerald, M., Posner, J. & Workman, A. (2012). *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of NGO Capacity Building Interventions in Conflict Affected Settings*. JSI Research & Training Institute, Inc, October.
- [41] Ghalem, Â., Okar, C., Chroqui, R., & Semma, E. (2016). Performance: A concept to define. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.24800.28165>.
- [42] Global Climate (2022). *Criticisms of Ngos*.
- [43] Gomm, R. (2008). *Social research methodology: A critical introduction* 2nd edition publication: Palgrave Macmillan England.
- [44] Golini, R., Kalchschmidt, M., & Landoni, P. (2015). Adoption of Project management practices: The Impact on international development projects of non-governmental organizations. *International Journal of Project management*, 33(3), 650-663.
- [45] Görgens, M. and Kusek, J.Z. (2009). *Making Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Work: A Capacity Development Toolkit*. The World Bank.
- [46] Gorgens, M., Kusek, J., Z., (2009): *Making monitoring and evaluation systems work: A capacity Development toolkit*, World Bank, Washington DC.
- [47] Havermans, J. (2000). *Burundi: Peace-Initiatives Help Stem the Violence: Searching for Peace in Africa*. [http://www.conflictprevention.net/dev/ECCP/ECCPSurveys\\_v0\\_10.nsf/vwWebSurveys/0524DCEF270B615EC1256B2700317DA](http://www.conflictprevention.net/dev/ECCP/ECCPSurveys_v0_10.nsf/vwWebSurveys/0524DCEF270B615EC1256B2700317DA).
- [48] Hawkins, D. and Jamieson, W. (2004): *Indicators and Policy, Indicators of Sustainable Development for Tourism Development – A Guidebook*, Madrid 2nd edition: World Tourism Organization.
- [49] Holvoet, N., & Inberg, L. (2015). Diagnostic Review of the Monitoring and Evaluation System of Uganda's Education Sector: Selected Findings and Discussion. *Journal of Education and Training*, 2(1), 134–154. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jet.v2i1.6720>.
- [50] Hofer, C. W., & Schendel, D. 1978. *Strategy formulation: Analytical concepts*. St. Paul, MN: West.
- [51] IFAD, (2002). *Managing for Impact in Rural Development; A Guide for Project M&E*. IFAD. Rome.
- [52] James, Cathy (2011). *Theory of Change Review: Report Commissioned by Comic Relief*. <http://mande.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/2012-Comic-Relief-Theory-of-Change-Review-FINAL.pdf>.
- [53] James, C (2011). *Comic Relief and Theory of Change*. Comic Relief, June 2011
- [54] Johanna, A & Alena, Z. (2014). Effect of organizational structure, leadership and communication on efficiency and productivity: A qualitative study of a public health-care organization. *Umea School of Business and Economics*.
- [55] Jones, B. (2013). The making of meaning: Churches, development projects and violence in Eastern Uganda. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 43, 75. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700666-12341245>
- [56] John, C. & Khilesh, C. (2008). *Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in development organisations*. New York, NY: Sage Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- [57] Julie, T. (2017). *Accountability to Communities and Beneficiaries*. WWF, [www.panda.org/standards](http://www.panda.org/standards).
- [58] Kamau, C. G., & Mohamed, H. B. (2015). Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Function in Achieving Project Success in Kenya: A Survey of County Government's Projects: Nairobi, Kenya. *Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology*.
- [59] Kareithi, R. N., & Lund, C. (2012). Review of NGO performance research published in academic journals between 1996 and 2008. *South African Journal of Science*, 108(11/12), 755.
- [60] Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley
- [61] Kim, D.R. (2005). *Up to No Good? Recent Critics and Critiques of NGOs*. Georgia State University.
- [62] King, P. 1975. Is the emphasis of capital budgeting theory misplaced? *Journal of Business, Finance and Accounting*, 2(1): 69-82.
- [63] Kirsch, D. C. (2013). *Accountability in Children's Development Organizations*. PH. D Thesis, 1-50.
- [64] Kothar, C.R. (2008). *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques: 3rd edition*. India New Age Publications Academic; New Delhi.
- [65] Koyo P. (2004). *Watershed Management Case Study: Burundi Comprehensive, integrated watershed and swamp management*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- [66] Kusek J. C and Rist, R. (2004). *A Handbook for Practitioners: Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation, J'3) + I4&%.'*
- [67] Kusek, J.Z & Rist, R. (2010). *A hand book for development practitioner. The step to results based monitoring and evaluation systems*; Washington. D.C. World Bank.
- [68] Lahey, R. (2015, November). *Common issues affecting monitoring and evaluation of large ILO projects: Strategies to address them. ival THINK Piece* (9).
- [69] Lenfant, F., & Rutten, R. (2013). Cordaid's experience with impact evaluation. *Development in Practice*, 23(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2013.753412>.
- [70] Lerner, J. S., and Tetlock, P. E. 1999. *Accounting for the Effects of Accountability*, *Psychological Bulletin* (125:2), pp. 255-275.
- [71] Lindblad, M.R. (2006). Performance measurement in local economic development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(5), pp. 646-672.
- [72] Lois, E.D (1990): *Case Study Evaluations*. United States General Accounting Office publication, Washington, D.C.
- [73] Massa, Massimo and Zhang, Lei, *The Effects of Organizational Structure on Asset Management* (February1,2008). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1101555> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1101555>.
- [74] Masuku, N. W. K., & Ijeoma, E. O. C. (2015). A Global Overview of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and its Meaning in the Local Government Context of South Africa. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 3(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/apsdpr.v3i2.79>
- [75] Mark, A. (2017). *NGOs Blessing or Curse: The African Report*, Nairobi.
- [76] Martens, K. (2002). *Mission impossible? Defining nongovernmental organizations*. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 13(3), 271–285. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020341526691>.
- [77] Mbogo, F. W, Mirara, A. (2022). Influence of budgetary allocation in monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian projects planning: A case of International Rescue Committee. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, 3(7), 88- 101.
- [78] McCoy, D., & Kinyua, K. (2015). Allocating scarce resources strategically- an evaluation and discussion of the global fund's pattern of disbursements. *PLoS one*, 7(5), e34749.
- [79] Miles, R.E., Snow, C.C., Meyer, A.D., & Coleman, H.J.JR. (1978). *Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process*. *Academy of Management Review*, 3 (3), 546-562.
- [80] Miller, J. (2007). *An effective performance measurement system: Developing an effective Performance measurement system for city of Elmira sub-grantees*. Unpublished manuscript, New York: Binghamton University, State University of New York.
- [81] Mitchell, T. R. (1993). Leadership, values, and accountability. In M. M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 109 – 136). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- [82] Mueller-Hirth, N. (2012). *If you don't count, you don't count: Monitoring and evaluation in South African NGOs*. *Development and Change*, 43(3), 649–670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2012.01776.x>.
- [83] Mugenda and Mugenda. (1998), *Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 1st Edition. Acts Press, Nairobi, Kenya.
- [84] Muller & Turner, (2007). *Matching the project manager's leadership style to project type*. *International journal of Project management* 25 (2007)21-32.
- [85] Mintzberg, H. (1980a). *The nature of managerial work*. Englewood Cliffs: PrenticeHall, Inc.
- [86] NDAYIZEYE L. (2018). *Capacity building and project sustainability in Ngozi Province, Burundi: a case study of agri-business project (PRODEFI)*. Kampala International University, College of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- [87] Nduwayo, G. (2003). *La société civile burundaise : ... Emergente, mais pas suffisamment visible*. *Le Bulletin du Parlement*, n° 005.



- [88] Njeri, J. W., & Omwenga, J. Q. (2019). Influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on sustainable projects: a case study of the national aids control council. *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, volume 6.
- [89] Njiiri, P. N. (2015). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Use on Performance of Non-governmental Organizations: A Case of Agribusiness Projects in Murang'a County, Kenya. A Research Project Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of Degree of Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi.
- [90] Nimpagaritse, M., Korachais, C., Roberfroid, D., Kolsteren, P., Idrissi, M., Meessen, B. (2016). Measuring and understanding the effects of a performance-based financing scheme applied to nutrition services in Burundi—a mixed method impact evaluation design. *International Journal for Equity in Health* volume 15, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-016-0382-0>.
- [91] NSW (2015). Monitoring and evaluation plan. Environmental Trust, PO Box 644, Parramatta 2124.
- [92] Obadare, E. (2013). *The Handbook of Civil Society in Africa (Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies (20)) (2014th ed.)*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-8262-8>.
- [93] Odile Muhayimana and James Kant Kamuhanda (2020). The relationship between Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices and public projects performance in Rwanda with reference to Science and Technology Skills Development (STSD) project. School of social science, Mount Kenya University.
- [94] O'Flynn, M (2012). Theory of Change: What's it all about? ONTRAC no. 51, INTRAC, May 2012
- [95] Pinto & Mantel, (2009). *Generic Project success and Project management criteria and factors*. Australia: Adelaide
- [96] PNUD (2019). *Rapport National sur le Développement Humain : Cohésion sociale, dividende démographique et développement humain durable*. PNUD Burundi.
- [97] Ramadan, M. A., & Borgonovi, E. (2015). Performance Measurement and Management in Non-Governmental Organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 70-76.
- [98] République du Burundi (2018). *Plan National de Développement du Burundi 2018-2027*. Bujumbura Burundi
- [99] Rumanya, H. et all (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation systems on the Performance of Projects in NGOs: A case study of Education Projects in Mombasa county, Kenya. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Management (ISSN-2520-08852)*, Vol.5, Issue No 2, pp 46-66. ([www.carijournals.org](http://www.carijournals.org)).
- [100] Search for Common Ground – Burundi (2008): *Key Findings from the Project Evaluation of “Promotion of Democratic Governance in Burundi, 2006-2008*
- [101] Sebudandi, C. & Nduwayo, G. (2001). *Etude sur la stratégie et le programme d'appui à la société civile burundaise*. Rapport final.
- [102] Samsonowa, T. (2012). *Industrial research performance management: Key performance indicators in the ICT industry*. Walldorf, Germany. Physica-Verlag.
- [103] Schlenker, B. R., Britt, T. W., Pennington, J., Murphy, R., & Doherty, K. (1994). The triangle model of responsibility. *Psychological Review*, 101, 632 – 652
- [104] Schlenker, B. R., & Weigold, M. F. (1989). Self-identification and accountability. In R. A. Giacalone, & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 21 – 43). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [105] Schoenherr, T., & Tummalala, V.R. (2007). Electronic procurement: a structured literature review and directions for future research. *International Journal of Procurement Management*, 1(1-2), 8-37.
- [106] Stephen, W. L. and Micah, N. J. (2017). *Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and Performance of Non-Governmental Based Maternal Health Projects in Bungoma South Sub-County, Kenya*. University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya. *European Scientific Journal* edition, Vol.13, No.23 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431.
- [107] Stefan S., Daniel B., Lydia P., Kathrin R., Kerstin F., Christina B., Marco P., Marc Z., Stefan L., Maria R., Rivas L., and Salvator R. (2020). *Spatial-Explicit Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments Based on Impact Chains: Findings from a Case Study in Burundi*. MDPI, Sustainability.
- [108] Stijn D. R. (2004). *The impact of international NGOs and civil society organizations on the peace process in Burundi*. Conflict Research Group, University of Ghent, Belgium.
- [109] Taylor-Powell, E., & Boyd, H. H. (2008). *Evaluation Capacity Building in Complex Organizations*. *New Directions for Evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?acno=EJ824994>.
- [110] Tetlock, P. E. 1983a. Accountability and Complexity of Thought, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (45:1), pp. 74-83.
- [111] Tetlock, P. E. 1983b. Accountability and the Perseverance of First Impressions, *Social Psychology Quarterly* (46:4), pp. 285-292.
- [112] Tetlock, P. E. 1999. Accountability Theory: Mixing Properties of Human Agents with Properties of Social Systems, in *Shared Cognition in Organizations: The Management of Knowledge*.
- [113] Tilbury, D. (2007). Monitoring and Evaluation during the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development*, 1(2), 239–254. doi:10.1177/097340820700100214.
- [114] USAID, (2019). *Best practices in Monitoring and Evaluation: Lessons from the USAID Turkey Population Program*. Turkey: Ankara.
- [115] UNAIDS. (2008) *Guidance on Capacity Building for HIV Monitoring and Evaluation*. Geneva UNAIDS.
- [116] Walter R. Borg, Meredith D. Gall, (2007) *Educational Research: An introduction*. 2nd edition: Publisher McKay, The University of Michigan United States of America.
- [117] Warutere, J.W. (2022). *Strategies for Performing Educational Projects: Use of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Tools*. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Volume 12, Issue 5, 491 ISSN 2250-3153.
- [118] WHO (2012), *Global Monitoring framework and strategy for the Global Plan towards the elimination of new HIV infections among children by 2015 and keeping mothers alive (EMTCT)*. 4th edition WHO Library Cataloguing: Geneva.
- [119] Woodhill, J. (2005). *M&E as learning: Rethinking the dominant paradigm. Monitoring and Evaluation of Soil Conservation and Watershed Development Projects*. Retrieved from <http://www.capfida.mg/km/atelier/wageningen/download>
- [120] World Bank. (2005). *Tamil Nadu Nutrition Project implementation volume*. Washington, DC: The World Bank, Population, Health and Nutrition Department.
- [121] Yang L., Sun, G. & Martin, J. (2008). *ICA Working paper making Strategy work: A literature review on the factors influencing strategy implementation*. Bern, Switzerland: Lugano Publishers.

#### AUTHORS

**First Author** – BIGIRIMANA Jonas, School of Social Sciences  
Mt. Kenya University College, Kenya