



ISSN: 2278 – 0211 (Online)

Determinants Of Effective Monitoring And Evaluation Of Strategy Implementation Of Community Based Projects

Dr. Fred Mugambi

Director, Jomo Kenyatta University Of Science And Technology
Mombasa CBD Campus, Nairobi, Kenya

Elizabeth Kanda

Jomo Kenyatta University Of Science And Technology
School Of Human Resource Development, Kengeleni Mombasa, Kenya

Abstract:

This study is carried out to determine factors affecting monitoring and evaluation of community based projects. Is important that the projects based in the community to be aware of these factors and put them into consideration right from project implementation so as to ensure the purpose of monitoring and evaluation is effectively achieved.

The first section of this paper focuses on the understanding of monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation of community based projects is affected by factors such as; lack of and understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluation, poor skills on results-based monitoring and evaluation, the purposes of evaluation, the actual monitoring and evaluation process and objectives of monitoring and evaluation. Without a proper understanding of monitoring and evaluation, this can affect the process hence achieving inefficient results. The second section is about the importance of partnership and how they contribute to M&E strategy implementation of community based projects. Stakeholders' analysis is also discussed in this section. Field visits is discussed in section three as it determines the effectiveness of M&E. Budgeting is very key in M&E, this is looked into in details in section four. Types of M&E within a program can also determine the effectiveness of strategy implementation and is analyzed in section five. If M&E results are not properly communicated, they can affect the effectiveness of M&E of strategy implementation of community based projects. This is looked into in section six of this paper. The study is limited to the identification of the determinants of effective M&E of community based projects. Desk research is the methodology that was used in carrying out this study.

Key words: Monitoring, Evaluation, Effective monitoring and evaluation, Community based projects, Result based monitoring

1.Introduction

The best-formulated strategies which can work effectively, may fail to produce good performance of an organization with community based projects using it if they are not successfully implemented, this is according to (Ben, 2002), as cited in (Noble, 1999b). And this can affect the monitoring and evaluation of the strategies as seen in (World Bank, 1980).

From (UNDP Evaluation web site, 2011), we find that there are many different (soft, hard and mixed) factors that influence the success of strategy monitoring and evaluation in community based projects, ranging from the people who communicate or implement the strategy to the systems or mechanisms in place for co-ordination and control. These factors need to be identified and dealt with to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in monitoring and evaluation of the community based projects as recommended by (John & Khilesh, 2008). Many of the projects faces a challenge in monitoring and evaluation of their projects as a result of many factors. This is according to (Pfohl, 1986). According to Messah and Mucai in their paper, Factors Affecting the Implementation of Strategic Plans in Government Tertiary Institutions: A Survey of Selected Technical Training Institutes, as cited in (Finkelstein, 2003), maps four circumstances in which strategic planning for monitoring and evaluation of community based projects failure is most likely to occur: launching new ventures, promoting innovation and change, managing mergers and acquisitions and responding to new environmental pressures (Gusfield, 1975).

While their citation from (Mintzberg, 1994) believes that the strategic planning models for monitoring and evaluation of community based projects of the 1960s and 1970s ultimately failed because, they did not distinguish between strategic planning and strategic thinking in monitoring and evaluation of community based projects. Citing from (Miller, 1990), Messah and Mucai found in their

research that the victories and strengths of some community based projects can often be the cause of their future monitoring and evaluation strategic failure.

2.Objective Of The Study

The aim of the study is to find out the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of strategy implementation of community based projects. Any organization focusing their projects in any community need to consider these determinants in order to effectively and efficiently realize their goals for project implementation in that community.

3.The Scope Of The Study

This study was limited to a study of the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of strategy implementation of community based projects in any organization, donor funded or Government project.

4.Methodology Of The Study

Desk research was used to carry out this study. Journals, books and other research papers on monitoring and evaluation were also studied in details to identify some of the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of strategy implementation of community based projects.

4.1.Monitoring & Evaluation

Monitoring is the systematic and routine collection of information from projects and programmes for four main purposes as written in (World Bank, 1980), to learn from experiences to improve practices and activities in the future (Ben, 2002), to have internal and external accountability of the resources used and the results obtained, to take informed decisions on the future of the initiative and to promote empowerment of beneficiaries of the initiative also discussed by (John & Khilesh, 2008). Evaluation is the assessing, as systematically and objectively as possible, a completed project or programme (or a phase of an ongoing project or programme that has been completed) Evaluations appraise data and information that inform strategic decisions, thus improving the project or programme in the future clearly indicated by (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008). From the point of view of (Pfohl, 1986), evaluations should help to draw conclusions about five main aspects of the intervention: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

4.1.1.Results-Based Monitoring And Evaluation (M&E)

From (John & Khilesh, 2008), we find that research-based M&E is a powerful management tool that is used to help stakeholders track progress and demonstrate the impact of their projects or programs. While results-based M&E tracks basic short-term program outputs, it puts an especially strong focus on assessing the program's medium- and long-term outcomes and impact as discussed in (UNDP Evaluation web site, 2011).

Currently, an increasing number of donors of community based projects have been focusing on assessing results rather than just monitoring progress on planned activities. This is indicated in (United Nations development program, 1997). As a result of analysis done within several organizations working in different communities, they decided to adopt a results-oriented approach to its work in order to keep track of progress on its strategic programs and the corresponding outcomes and impacts (Ben, 2002), as well as to meet the increasingly rigorous requirements of their various donors and partners as noted by (Jody & Ray, 2004).

Results based M&E is an essential tool to ensure the most effective and efficient uses of resources, determine the extent to which the program/ project is on track and to make any needed corrections accordingly and evaluate the extent to which the program/ project is having or has had the desired impact, (World Bank, 1980) clearly indicated this aspect.(UNDP, 2000) argues that result based monitoring is done in the communities so as to ensure that implementation is moving according to plans and identify areas needing further support for non-governmental organizations having community based projects (John & Khilesh, 2008), improve the quality of routine work at the village level, to provide baseline information for evaluations of projects and to feed into project planning and development in the communities (Pfohl, 1986).

Both monitoring and evaluation are management tools. (Jody & Ray, 2004) say that in the case of monitoring, information is routinely gathered for tracking progress according to previously agreed plans and schedules.

Evaluation is more episodic than monitoring writes (World Bank, 1980). It is facilitated by monitoring but utilizes additional sources of information (IFAD, 2005b). Many such sources are identified during project reviews when there is a need to understand why inputs did not lead to planned outputs or what the impact of a programme has been as written in (John & Khilesh, 2008).

Tracking progress using M&E data can also assist managers in identifying areas for technical support or capacity building, both among staff and NGO partners, this is how (Pfohl, 1986) takes it . Regular feedback of monitoring results can be encouraging both to NGO partners and non-support staff. M&E also provides useful opportunities for staff and stakeholder participation (UNDP Evaluation web site, 2011). All these factors need to be considered since they affect monitoring and evaluation of community based projects.

4.2.Importance Of Partnerships

No development change is ever achieved in isolation. Partners may include governments, donor agencies, governmental and Non-governmental organizations that have projects in communities or are willing to support projects based in in the communities, this is as seen in (Kalali, Ali & Davod, 2011).

Ideally, when formulating interventions to achieve certain outcomes, Program Managers should consider how to encourage the participation of partners according to (John & Khilesh, 2008). This requires knowing what strengths each partner brings to the table. For monitoring and evaluation, program managers may draw on partners in a number of ways as cited from (World Bank, 1980), such as involving partners and other stakeholders in the selection of indicators and targets, in data collection and analysis, as participants in field visits or as members of an evaluation team, using already-established data sources and statistics of key partner agencies, which helps reduce the costs of data collection according to (Pfohl, 1986), working with partners to analyze outcome progress and determine how best to enhance their collective strategy and program Managers may engage various types of partners in a variety of activities associated with monitoring and evaluation (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008).

4.2.1. Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder analysis is commonly used to identify all the groups and individuals who have a stake, or vested interest, in the success or failure of a project or activity, as cited from (DFID 1995a, Clayton et al 1996). According to (INTRA Resources, 2011) as cited from (DFID 1995a), "stakeholder analysis is the identification of a project's key stakeholders, an assessment of their interests, and the ways in which these interests affect project riskiness and viability." This affects monitoring and evaluation of community based projects (Ben, 2002).

The first step in a stakeholder analysis is to identify and list all potential stakeholders in participating in community based projects (IFAD, 2005b). These can be listed under the headings of primary, secondary and external stakeholders. Primary stakeholders can be categorized according to social analysis and divided by gender, social or income classes, occupational or service user groups as suggested by (Kalali, Ali & Davod K, 2011). There may be some overlap among the categories of primary stakeholders (e.g. Women and low income groups, or minor forest users and ethnic minorities). Secondary stakeholders can be divided into funding, implementing, monitoring and advocacy organizations, or into governmental, NGO and private sector organizations (UNDP Evaluation web site, 2011). These categories may need to be further sub-divided. For example, key individuals may have personal interests at stake as well as formal institutional objectives; organizations may have sub-groups which should be considered as stakeholders as written in (DFID 1995a).

New stakeholder groups may be created as a result of the intervention of a project that brings new or additional resources to an area according to (DFID 1995c).

The FAO People's Participation Programme (PPP) emphasized that evaluation of stakeholder participation is: concerned with processes which are qualitative and not results that are quantitative; and more concerned with description and interpretation than with measurement and prediction as suggested by (Marsden and Oakley 1984).

The measurement of participation requires the valid criteria for understanding the nature of participation in a rural development project, a set of indicators to give form to these criteria, appropriate methods at the project level for monitoring the indicators and maintaining a continuous record of the process of participation and Interpretation of the information recorded in terms of making a judgment concerning participation this is according to (Marsden and Oakley 1984).

Because traditional monitoring and evaluation has been concerned with quantifiable measurements, there is a new focus on the qualitative aspects of participation and on the process of participation. However, both qualitative and quantitative aspects of participation are important (Clayton et al 1994, Marsden and Oakley 1994, Oakley 1988, Oakley 1991, Rudqvist and Woodford-Berger 1996s).

According to (IFAD, 2005b), participation is a dynamic process that must be evaluated over time and conventional ex post evaluations are inadequate. Ongoing monitoring is the only way qualitative descriptions can be obtained over time. It should be participatory, involving the rural people involved in the project.

Key characteristics of this qualitative approach to evaluating stakeholder participation are described in (Clayton et al 1994, Oakley 1991). Naturalistic is a study of processes rather than on the basis of pre-determined and expected outcomes (John & Khilesh, 2008). Heuristic is subject to continuous redefinition as knowledge of projects and its outcome increases. Holistic is viewing the project as a whole, needing to be understood from many different perspectives (UNDP Evaluation web site, 2011). And inductive is seeking to understand outcomes without imposing predetermined expectations or benchmarks (IFAD, 2005b). It begins with specific observations and builds towards a general pattern of outcomes (INTRA Resources, 2011).

4.3. Field Visits As It Affects M&E

Field visits are frequently used as a monitoring mechanism. It is common policy to conduct regular field visits. Consideration should be given to the timing of the visit, its purpose in terms of monitoring, and what to look for in order to measure progress (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008). This affects greatly the monitoring and evaluation of strategy implementation of the community based projects.

Field visits may be undertaken by the Program Manager, the Policy Advisor and/or a team from the organization, (particularly when dealing with a complex outcome) (UNDP, 2000).

Considering time, a field visit may be planned for any time of the year. If undertaken in the first half of the year, it may be oriented towards the validation of results. If undertaken in the latter part of the year, the field visit should provide the latest information on progress (Ben, 2002). The reports of field visits are action-oriented and brief, submitted within a week of return to the office according to (UNDP 2000).

Looking at the purpose, field visits serve the purpose of validation. They validate the results reported by program and projects (Pfohl, 1986). They involve an assessment of progress, results and problems and may also include visits to the project management or

directorates according to (IFAD, 2005b). Visits are increasingly combining joint efforts of several partners involving clusters of programs and projects within an outcome (John & Khilesh, 2008). A team of Program Managers, for example, may undertake a series of visits to projects that are contributing to one particular outcome. Such joint efforts are often an efficient way to obtain a comprehensive overview of progress (PP M&E, 2008).

From the point of view of focus, what should we look at during a field visit? The emphasis is on observing the progress being made towards the attainment of results (outcome and outputs) that are contributing to the goals of the program (World Bank, 1980). The Program Manager works in a community based project, should also look at the contribution of soft interventions, the development of strategic partnerships and rates progress towards outputs and outcome (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008).

In a change from past practice, detailed implementation issues will no longer be the main focus of field visits.

4.3.1. Conducting Good Monitoring

(Ben, 2002) writes, the credibility of findings and assessments depends to a large extent on the manner in which monitoring and evaluation is conducted in the community based projects. According to (UNDP, 2000), good monitoring focuses on results and follow-up. It looks for “what is going well” and “what is not progressing” in terms of progress towards intended results (Pfohl, 1986). It then records this in reports, makes recommendations and follows-up with decisions and action; good monitoring depends to a large measure on good design (Ben, 2002). If a project is poorly designed or based on faulty assumptions, even the best monitoring is unlikely to ensure its success. Particularly important is the design of a realistic results chain of outcome, outputs and activities (United Nations development program, 1997). Offices should avoid using monitoring for correcting recurring problems that need permanent solutions; good monitoring requires regular visits by the organization staff that focus on results and follow-up to verify and validate progress according to (John & Khilesh, 2008). In addition, the Program Manager must organize visits and/or bilateral meetings dedicated to assessing progress, looking at the big picture and analysing problem areas writes (Gusfield, 1975). The Program Manager ensures continuous documentation of the achievements and challenges as they occur and does not wait until the last moment to try to remember what happened and therefore regular analysis of reports such as the annual project report (APR) is another minimum standard for good monitoring (Kalali, Ali & Davod K, 2011). Such reports, prepared by Project Management or Directors for the audience of the country office and other partners, serve as a basis for analysis by the organization program managers (IFAD, 2005b), says that monitoring also benefits from the use of participatory monitoring mechanisms to ensure commitment, ownership, follow-up and feedback on performance. This is indispensable for outcome monitoring where progress cannot be assessed without any knowledge of what partners are doing (IFRC, 2011). Participatory mechanisms include outcome groups, stakeholder meetings, steering committees and focus group interviews. According to (PP M&E, 2008), good monitoring finds ways to objectively assess progress and performance based on clear criteria and indicators (Cooke, Bill, & Uma, 2001) notes the same. To better assess progress towards outcomes, country offices must make an effort to improve their performance measurement system by developing indicators and baselines. (World Bank, 1980) adds that assessing the relevance, performance and success of organization development interventions also enhances monitoring this is also according to (Gusfield, 1975). The country office periodically asks critical questions about the continued relevance of the support to the activity, and strives to judge performance and success- or lack thereof- based on empirical evidence (UNDP Evaluation web site, 2011). The findings are used for decision-making on programming and support; finally, as part of good monitoring, the country office is seen to actively generate lessons learned (IFAD, 2005b), ensure learning through all monitoring tools, adapt strategies accordingly and avoid repeating mistakes from the past (Pfohl, 1986). The use of electronic media for memory and sharing lessons is also considered a minimum standard according to (Ben, 2002).

4.4. Budgeting In Monitoring And Evaluation Of Community Based Projects

Budgeting for an evaluation depends upon the complexity of the project or outcome to be evaluated and the purpose of the exercise (United Nations development program, 1997). These factors dictate the timeframe and the number of evaluators needed writes (UNDP, 2000). For projects, evaluation resources are allocated from the monitoring and evaluation lines of the project budget. Similarly, outcome evaluations draw on the respective monitoring and evaluation allocations of the projects and programs that contribute to that outcome (IFAD, 2005b).

When budgeting for an outcome evaluation, an organization should consider the scope, complexity and time commitments of the evaluation writes (PP M&E 2008). An outcome evaluation conducted early in the Country Program is apt to be less complex and entail a smaller scope and time commitment than would a “heavier” exercise conducted at the end of the Country program this is according to (Gusfield, 1975). The greater the complexity and scope of an evaluation, the longer time and more detailed work will be required of the evaluation team, thus increasing evaluators’ fees as seen in (Kalali, Ali & Davod K, 2011). The duration of an outcome evaluation will be determined by its purpose, with earlier, shorter-term exercises costing less than later, longer-term exercises (Pfohl, 1986) and the need to minimize time and expense. It is recommended in (Ben, 2002) that country offices provide the evaluation requirements to all short-listed candidates for the evaluation team leader position, so that the team leader may provide feedback on the methodology and timing of the mission. This can help minimize the time spent on preparation (IFAD, 2005b). Another way to minimize time is to hire firms rather than individuals, in cases where firms charge a flat rate for the entire evaluation rather than daily rates for additional, unexpected time; and the use of field visits and interviews (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008). Outcome evaluations may require evaluators to speak with a range of partners (Cooke, Bill, & Uma, 2001), stakeholders and beneficiaries about perceptions of progress towards results or the production of an organization’s outputs.

4.4.1.The Resource Allocation Filter

Factors that affect and ultimately comprise a company's strategy stream continuously from these intended and emergent sources. Regardless of the source, however, they then must flow through a common filter – the resource allocation process (Gusfield, 1975). This is because a company's actual strategy is manifest only through the stream of new products, processes, services and acquisitions to which resources are allocated (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008). The resource allocation process acts like a filter that determines which intended and/or emergent initiatives get funding and pass through, and which proposals are denied resources (Clayton, Christensen & Tara).

The resource allocation process is a complex, diffused process that occurs at every level, every day, in all companies. Senior managers regularly decide which projects or capital investments to fund, and which ones to kill (United Nations development program, 1997). Each of these types of decisions, occurring at all levels of the organization every day, comprises its resource allocation process according to (IFAD, 2005a).

If the criteria that guide prioritization decisions in this diffused resource allocation process are not carefully tied to the company's intended strategy (and often they are not), significant disparities can develop between a company's intended strategy and its actual strategy (Pfohl, 1986). Understanding and controlling the criteria by which day-to-day resource allocation decisions are made at all levels of the organization, therefore, is a key challenge in managing the process of defining and implementing strategy in community based projects as indicated in (Clayton, Christensen & Tara).

4.4.2.Project Sustainability

In order to ensure community based project sustainability, an organization must consider four essential dimensions as discussed in (John & Khilesh, 2008), Institutional sustainability is where functional institutions will be self-sustaining after the project ends, Household and community resilience focuses on resilient communities which are readily able to anticipate and adapt to change through clear decision-making processes, collaboration, and management of resources internal and external to the community, Environmental sustainability considers that an environmentally sustainable system must maintain a stable resource base, avoid over exploitation of renewable resources and preserve biodiversity and Structural change where the structural dimensions of poverty are addressed through the empowerment of poor and marginalized rural households (Cooke, Bill, & Uma, 2001).

Other factors, such as external policies and institutional context, will also have a direct influence on project monitoring and evaluation, but are typically outside project control (IFRC, 2011). For example, the sustainability of community based projects-supported interventions is likely to be compromised in areas characterized by weak institutions, lack of markets, lack of income-generating opportunities, or in fragile states experiencing civil conflict (World Bank, 1980). The following strategies could be effective to ensure sustainability of the project. Projects must systematically identify, analyze and respond to risks in a way that ensures continuation of project benefits after completion of the project (Gusfield, 1975), Projects should seek ways to strengthen the capacity of individuals, households, communities and formal and informal institutions that will help them cope with future shocks (IFAD, 2005a). Projects should cause 'no harm' to the environment and should meet "the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (IFAD, 2005).

4.5.Types Of Monitoring And Evaluation Within Programs

Types of monitoring and evaluation within a program, can affect M&E of strategy implementation of a community based project. Assessment and Planning, Input/ Output Monitoring, Outcome Monitoring, Impact Monitoring, Process Evaluation, Outcome Evaluation and Impact Evaluation (Pfohl, 1986). The complexity of M&E systems is a factor of the levels of the program/ project. Systems that are international are more complex than those that are national or sub-national level (Kalali, Ali & Davod K, 2011). Similarly, those for programs covering only one administrative region such as a province or district are simpler than a national one. Looking at type of Program, some programs are comprehensive in nature providing more than one intervention thus the M&E system may be complex to capture all aspects of the program unlike a vertical project that only handles one intervention area according to (IFAD, 2005b). The information need varies at different levels depending on the need for the information at program level the information would be needed to indicate the progress the organization is making while at national level it could be for decision making on resource allocation (World Bank, 1980). Scope of the M&E Effort is very critical in that the cost of M&E activities, required level of involvement is sometimes too high necessitating a tradeoff to maintain the activities at a cost effective level thus reducing the complexity of the activities as noted by (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008).

4.5.1.Developing An M&E Plan

Developing an M&E plan requires a proper understanding of the program, inputs, processes, output and outcomes according to (Cooke, Bill, & Uma, 2001). The inputs required would include human resources with M&E technical capacity and resources, authority and mandate to develop the M&E plan and technology infrastructure as noted by (Kalali, Ali & Davod K, 2011). The process would involve advocating for the need for M&E, assessing strategic information needs (including planning for M&E utilization dissemination), achieving consensus and commitment among stakeholders, particularly on Indicators and reporting structure & tools, developing mechanism for M&E plan review, and preparing document for final approval (Gusfield, 1975). It should be noted that the M&E plan needs to be written during the initial stages of program development written in (Pfohl, 1986). The output would be an M&E plan that is a comprehensive document that describes the M&E system and includes the elements of an M&E plan

as provided in the Introduction to M&E plan, has the approval of the governing authority and has the consensus of key stakeholders as argued by (Jody & Ray, 2004).

Program changes can affect the M&E plan performance monitoring and impact evaluation. It is important to change the M&E plan as the program changes so that program performance can be accurately measured according to (World Bank, 1980). Having an internal M&E capacity facilitates adjustments to the M&E plan since flexibility and regular review of program results is necessary.

4.6. Communicating M&E Results

According to (PP M&E, 2005), communication is an exchange of information relevant to audiences, integral to the stages of project implementation and improvement and conducted on a formal or informal basis. Communication objective is to raise awareness among community about the products and/ or services being offered by a program/ project indicated by (IFAD, 2005b). Designing communication materials requires that one has a proper understanding of the targeted audience. Audiences could be classified into primary audiences who are those who directly affect your program's/ project's performance. For example in a program promoting breastfeeding, primary audiences are women of childbearing age (Gusfield, 1975). Secondary audiences are those who can influence those directly affecting your program/ project performance (Cooke, Bill, &Uma, 2001). The secondary audiences in breastfeeding programs are the significant others i.e. spouse, other community members e.g. grandmothers etc.

Possible audiences to communication include political leaders, government officials, program managers, private sector, educators, business/ civic leaders, news media, donors, religious leaders, professional associations, and women's groups among others (Pfohl, 1986). Developing effective messages for community based projects, demands that one knows its target audiences in terms of their likes and dislikes (Cooke, Bill, &Uma, 2001), their media consumption habits, their knowledge on the program/ project and their social and demographic characteristics as indicated in (United Nations development program, 1997). In-depth knowledge of the audiences requires audience research with the target audiences by way of focus group discussion and key informant interviews (Yang, Sun & Martin, 2008).

In developing messages it's important to start with the data, select two or three points that need to be communicated, tailor the message to fit the audience and deliver through a credible source that is used by the target audience argues (IFAD, 2005a). Always remember to avoid technical jargon in the communication and remain realistic.

5. Discussion

There are several factors which affect monitoring and evaluation of community based projects. It is important that the projects based in the community to be aware of these factors and put them into consideration right from project implementation. The staff or the groups carrying out the monitoring and evaluation should be aware of what is monitoring and evaluation and should be able to know all that is expected of them. Without a proper understanding of monitoring and evaluation, this can affect the process hence achieving inefficient results. Proper monitoring should be based on the results.

Knowing and understanding the partners and all stakeholders is vital in community based projects. This can affect monitoring and evaluation in terms of funding, requirements and what information will be required by each stakeholder. For effectiveness and efficiency, a proper stakeholder analysis needs to be conducted to ensure the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of each stakeholder are identified.

Field visits should be planned and carried out at appropriate time so as to ensure the staff and well aware of the project areas and hence enabling them to carry out monitoring and evaluation easily.

Budgeting and resource allocation also affect monitoring and evaluation and this is required to be planned well to ensure the monitoring and evaluation of community projects is done effectively.

The monitoring and evaluation team should understand well the types of M&E within the program so as to plan in advance and know what will be required during monitoring and evaluation.

Communication of the M&E results will determine if the monitoring and evaluation would have an impact in the improvement of the project towards achieving results. If the monitoring and evaluation results are not well communicated, there will be a poor analysis of the project and this should be reduced to a great extent because it can have an effect on the project when it comes to future funding.

6. Conclusion And Recommendations

In conclusion, I will say, that monitoring and evaluation of community based projects are affected by many factors and any person carrying out monitoring and evaluation of community based projects should bear in mind the following; The M&E steps are interconnected and should be viewed as part of a mutually supportive M&E system-We identify separate steps to help organize and guide the discussion; M&E planning should be done by those who use the information-Involvement of project/programme staff and key stakeholders ensures feasibility, understanding and ownership of the M&E system; Begin planning for your M&E system immediately after the project/programme design stage- Early M&E planning allows for preparation of adequate time, resources and personnel before project/programme implementation; it also informs the project/programme design process itself as it requires people to realistically consider how practical it is to do everything they intend to measure-Sometimes, the timing of the M&E planning is determined by donor requirements (e.g. at the proposal stage), and additional M&E planning may occur after a project/programme is approved and funded; A project/programme M&E system builds upon the initial assessment and project/ programme design-It can be based on the short-term, intermediate and long-term objectives and their indicators identified in the project's log frame, the informational requirements and expectations of stakeholders, as well as other practical considerations, such as project/programme

budget and time frame; When appropriate, it is useful to build on existing M&E capacities and practices-New M&E processes may not only burden the local capacity but they can alienate local stakeholders. If existing M&E practices are accurate, reliable and timely, this can save time/resources and build ownership to coordinate with and complement them; Particular attention should be given to stakeholder interests and expectations throughout the M&E process; M&E should be tailored and adjusted to the real-world context throughout the project/programme's life cycle- Projects/programmes operate in a dynamic setting, and M&E activities need to adapt accordingly. Objectives may change, as will the M&E system as it refines its processes and addresses arising problems and concerns. Like a project/programme itself, the M&E system should be monitored, periodically reviewed and improved upon; only monitor and evaluate what is necessary and sufficient for project/programme management and accountability- It takes time and resources to collect, manage and analyses data for reporting. Extra information is more often a burden than a luxury. It can distract attention away from the more relevant and useful information. It can also overload and strain a project/programme's capacity and ability to deliver the very services it is seeking to measure; the purpose and scope of the M&E system answers, "Why do we need M&E and how comprehensive should it be?"- It serves as a reference point for the M&E system, guiding key decisions such as informational needs, methodological approaches, capacity building and allocation of resources. The following outlines some key considerations when determining an M&E system's purpose and scope.

I recommend more study to be made in challenges facing the field staff working in community based projects when carrying out monitoring and evaluation activities. This can bring out factors that need to be considered keenly in all the monitoring and evaluation activities of community based projects so as to obtain effective outcomes from the projects.

7. References

1. Ben M. A. (2002) Community self-Assessment, monitoring and evaluation: Technical support mission report notes, World Bank: processed
2. Clayton M. Christensen and Tara D., The process of strategy development and implementation
3. Cooke, Bill, & Uma K. (2001), Participation: the new tyranny? London, Zed Books
4. Gusfield J. R. (1975), community: A critical Response. Oxford. Basil Blackwell
5. IFAD (2005a) Direct Supervision Pilot Programme: Corporate-level evaluation. Report No. 1687. Office of Evaluation. Rome.
6. IFAD (2005b) Independent external evaluation of IFAD. Office of Evaluation. Rome.
7. IFRC, (2011), Monitoring and Evaluation web page. www.ifrc.org/MandE
8. INTRAC Resources. (2011). International NGO Training and Research Center. www.intrac.org/resources.php M and E News web site: <http://mande.co.uk/>
9. Jody, Z. K. & Ray C.R. (2004) Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Development Practitioners, Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.
10. John, C. & Khilesh, C. (2008), Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in Development Organizations, United States: Sage Publications Pvt. Ltd
11. Kalali N. S, Ali A. P and Davod K. (2011), why does strategic plans implementation fail? A study in the health service sector of Iran African Journal of Business Management Vol. 5(23), pp. 9831-9837
12. Messah B. O, & Mucai P.G, Factors Affecting the Implementation of Strategic Plans in Government Tertiary Institutions: A Survey of Selected Technical Training Institutes, European Journal of Business and Management www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online) Vol 3, No.3 85
13. (PPM&E,) (2008). Participatory Planning Monitoring & Evaluation Resource Portal. <http://portals.wdi.wur.nl/>
14. Pfohl, J. (1986) Participatory evaluation: a user guide, New York: USAID
15. UNDP, (2000) New Approach to Monitoring in Uzbekistan, RBEC best practice newsletter no.4, <http://intra.undp.org/rbec>
16. UNDP Evaluation web site, (2011), United Nations Development Programme. <http://www.undp.org/ea/>
17. United Nations development program (UNDP). (1997), who are the question-makers? Participatory evaluation Handbook. New York: UNDP
18. World Bank, (1980), Tamil Nadu Nutrition Project Implementation Volume. The World Bank, Population, Health and Nutrition Department. Washington, DC:
19. Yang L., Sun G. & Martin J. (2008), ICA Working Paper Making Strategy Work: A Literature Review on the Factors influencing Strategy Implementation, Switzerland, Lugano