

**INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS AND EVALUATION QUALITY IN NON-GOVERNMENTAL
ORGANISATIONS IN UGANDA. A CASE STUDY OF FHI360 UGANDA.**

BY

KIRUNDA RAMADHAN

JAN15/PM&E/0365U

SUPERVISOR: DR KYALIMPA PAUL

**A PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF
MASTERS IN PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF UGANDA
TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY (UTAMU).**

May, 2015

Table of contents

CHAPTER ONE	4
INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Background to the study	4
1.2 Statement of the Problem	12
1.3 Purpose of the study	13
1.4 Objectives of the study	13
1.5 Research questions	13
1.6 Hypotheses of the study	13
1.7 Conceptual framework on institutional factors and project quality	14
1.8 Justification of the study	14
1.9 Scope of the study	15
1.10 Significance of the study	15
Definition of key terms	16
CHAPTER TWO	18
LITERATURE REVIEW	18
2.0 Introduction	18
CHAPTER THREE	28
METHODOLOGY	28
3.0 Introduction	28
3.1 Research design	28
3.2 Study population	28
3.3 Sample Size and selection	29
Table 1: Number of participants per category	29
3.4 Sampling Methods	29
3.5 Data Collection methods	30
3.5.1 Quantitative methods	30
Questionnaire method	30
3.5.2 Qualitative methods	30
Interview method	30
Document review method	31
3.6 Data collection instruments	31
3.6.1 Questionnaires	31

3.6.2 Interview guide	31
3.6.3 Document review checklist.....	32
3.7 Validity and Reliability.....	32
3.7.2 Reliability.....	32
3.8 Procedure for data Collection	33
3.9 Data Management and Analysis	33
3.9.1 Quantitative data	33
3.9.2 Qualitative data	34
References	35

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The impetus to carry out this research arises from the continuous challenges that continue to exist in project evaluation process of where the actual project evaluation objectives are hardly realised in the project management process in Non-Government organisations. This raises a lot of questions from the different stakeholders of the project on the quality of evaluation and the likely overall project impact and fulfilment of its intended objectives hence the research.

The aim of this study is to examine the influence of institutional factors on the quality of the project evaluation at FHI360-Uganda. The proposal is structured into three chapters. Chapter one presents the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, hypotheses, conceptual framework, scope of the study, justification of the study, significance of the study and definition of terms and concepts. The next chapter explores the literature on the subject, and the last chapter describes the methodology that will be used to carry out the study.

1.1 Background to the study

The background to the study provides an over view to the study. It presents the historical perspective of institutional factors and project evaluation, theoretical background provides a guiding theoretical view and shows some of the aspects that empirically explain project evaluation and institutional factors in project management, conceptual background explains concepts used in the study whereas the contextual background provides the extent to which institutional factors may influence the quality of project evaluation.

Historical background

Projects remain the instruments of choice for all stakeholders in international development. Yet, the poor performance of projects and the disappointment of project stakeholders and beneficiaries seem to have become the rule and not the exception in contemporary reality. Dissatisfaction with project results and performance dates back to the 1950s. The World Bank's private arm, the International Finance Corporation has discovered that only half of its African projects succeed (Ahsan and Gunawan, 2010), this partly is blamed on institutional factors and the quality of evaluations carried out.

Historically, on a wider perspective (Rossi et al, 2004) assert project evaluation evaluation-like activities were already evident in the eighteenth century in the fields of education and public health. There was realisation that programmes need to be evaluated in relation to the achievement of specific objectives (Seedat et al., 2001). Most scholars' documentation of programme evaluation's history draws the link to the Second World War when the US federal government's vast expenditure on the social sphere required a more systematic and rigorous review of spending. This resulted in the emergence of the field of programme evaluation. By the time programme evaluation reached Africa, scholars in the United States had already been debating programme evaluation's legitimacy as a discipline, conceptualised the different training options and delivered a multitude of theorists and evaluation paradigms.

Previously, evaluations were planned, implemented and produced for donors, but increasingly the evaluation process is seen as involving all the partners. Furthermore, what is being required of evaluators by these various partners is increasingly complex, and evaluators can now find themselves working to a range of audiences and masters. Older principles of accountability and conditionality are now replaced with an increasing stress on the learning functions of the

evaluation process (Collin and Stirrat 2008). In Uganda program evaluation is a recent phenomenon that was discovered a few decades ago with the intensification of nongovernmental programs that required more regular accountability.

Theoretical background

The study will be guided by goals based theory-program theory (Tyler, 1940) which is the classic model on program evaluation and organizational evaluation where results are assessed only in relation to the predetermined goals. The evaluator closely scrutinizes the object of evaluation in relation to its goals (Hansen 2005). Goals in this approach include objectives, performance targets and expected outcomes. The goals-based approach to evaluation was developed by Tyler in the late 1940s and has continued to evolve since. The key strength of this model is the determination of whether results align with goals. The degree of alignment between goals and results is important to know from accountability and improvement perspectives. Cameron (1986) argues that using the goal-attainment model is only possible and useful if the goals of the evaluated object are clear, if there is consensus about them, and if they are time-bound and measurable. However, this approach disregards side effects and unanticipated effects, it does not consider costs and the relevance of the goals is not questioned (Mickwitz, 2003). The approach does not question whether the chosen goals or targets are valid or appropriate measures of effectiveness. If this approach is seen as equivalent to an outcome or summative evaluation, underlying mechanisms and process questions might be ignored. Policy makers and evaluators are often interested in the unintended consequences or outcomes of a policy, programme or project. These unintended outcomes may be beneficial or harmful.

Conceptual background

Project evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation quality looks at attainment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Therefore an evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors (Stufflebeam, 2011).

Evaluation is an assessment of a planned, ongoing or completed intervention. The main goal of evaluation is to analyze the relevance of a programme or project and its contribution to objectives, as well as its efficiency, effectiveness, targeting efficiency and impacts (expected and unexpected) and sustainability. An evaluation must provide credible and useful information, making it possible to integrate lessons learned from experience into the decision-making process (OECD, 2002). Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an intervention and its contribution to global objectives. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results, chain processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack therefore. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and the contributions of the implementing bodies (United Nations evaluation group 2005)

The competence of the evaluator is one factor that affects the quality of evaluations world over. This has called for the establishment of professional bodies in various countries with the aim of equipping the evaluators with adequate skills to be able to do the job well and professionally. Based on differences in training, experience, and work settings, the profession of evaluation

encompasses diverse perceptions about the primary purpose of evaluation. These include but are not limited to the following: bettering products, personnel, programs, organizations, governments, consumers and the public interest; contributing to informed decision making and more enlightened change; precipitating needed change; empowering all stakeholders by collecting data from them and engaging them in the evaluation process; and experiencing the excitement of new insights (Kahan & Goodstadt 2005).

In project evaluation quality, the criteria include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Relevance refers to the extent to which the project suits the priorities of the target group, the recipient and the donor. Efficiency refers to the extent to which the project uses the least costly resources possible to achieve the desired results. Effectiveness refers to the extent to which the project meets its objectives. Impact refers to the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or not. Sustainability refers to whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn (Ika, 2009).

Project evaluation quality entails both efficiency and effectiveness with critical institutional success factors that refer more specifically to conditions, events and circumstances contributing to project success (Jugdev and Müller, 2005; Ika, 2009). The most well-known list of such factors include project mission, top-management support, project schedule, client consultation, personnel, technical tasks, client-acceptance, monitoring and feedback, communication, and finally, troubleshooting (Pinto and Slevin, 2008).

Contextual background

Institutional factors have a significant impact on the quality of evaluations key to project success. Diallo and Thuillier (2004) surveyed African national projects and identified quality evaluations based on fulfillment of objectives, time taken in evaluation, and budget used in carrying out the evaluation. The usefulness of an evaluation depends on credibility which relies on transparency of the process and the quality of the evaluation. The quality of the evaluation has to be checked at four levels: the terms of reference, the evaluation process, the evaluation report and the dissemination and feedback of the relevant stakeholders.

Evaluation is premised on the common idea that quality is discernible and capable of representation. To distinguish quality one must be able to discriminate and to tell the difference between the absence and presence of quality. Discerning quality is always a matter of expectation and comparison. Notions of quality have no meaning absent notions of inferiority, insignificance, worthlessness, and unimportance. One rarely deals with a situation in which the judgment of quality is clear-cut and straightforward. Judgments of quality usually leave room for doubt (Stake & Schwandt, 2005).

However, in most developing economies quality evaluations are hampered by institutional factors that largely affect effective processes of project evaluations. In this there is a cost challenge where program evaluation may prove expensive if the implementing team does not effectively manage the evaluation costs. A rigorous evaluation can cost more than a program has allotted. Also, evaluation efforts may be time consuming and could divert staff from the day-to-day program functioning. Evaluations may require expertise to determine appropriate methodologies to use with other important aspects in the evaluation process and such expertise

may be lacking and these challenges significantly affect the quality of an evaluation in the long run (Cooksy et al, 2001).

In the past, evaluation capacity development focused on strengthening the capacities of individuals' knowledge and skills. However, it is by now clear that capacity development should be based on a systemic approach that takes into account three major levels (individual, institutional, and external enabling environment), and two components (demand and supply) tailored to the specific context of each country (Karkara, 2013).

The institutional framework for evaluation ensures that a system exists to implement and safeguard the independence, credibility and utility of evaluation within an organization. At the individual level, a capacity development strategy should strengthen senior management capacity to strategically plan evaluations and to identify the key evaluation questions; and to manage and use evaluations (Karkara, 2013).

The number of evaluations submitted to USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) decreased from nearly 500 in 1994 to approximately 170 in 2009, despite an almost three-fold increase in program dollars managed. Over that period, the Agency's evaluation activities have been subject to both internal and external critiques regarding methodological quality, objectivity, access to evaluation findings, and use of evaluation recommendations for decision making (USAID Evaluation policy 2011). Reed and Morariu (2010) in the *state of evaluation study* in the United States of America found out that too few organizations have the support, capacity, and expertise they need to harness the power of evaluation. Richer, qualitative data is being passed over in favour of more easily collected and analysed quantitative data. Evaluation isn't being used to paint the full picture of effectiveness, progress, and outcomes or the lack

thereof. Morariu & Pankaj (2012), *state of evaluation* study found that limited staff time, insufficient financial resources, and limited staff expertise in evaluation are significant barriers to evaluation across the not for profit sector. These are the same top three challenges named in State of Evaluation 2010.

In Uganda project evaluation among government and non government projects still face significant challenges in terms of achieving the actual objectives to the evaluation process was meant for and largely the costs involved in finishing an evaluation exercise. However, the discipline in Uganda is steadily growing in recognition of the need to determine the exact effects of development programmes and policies on the population. All institutions, whether in the public or private sector, are increasingly interested in rationalizing available resources so that the most strategic interventions are implemented. Knowing what works or does not can only be determined through implementation and dissemination of timely and credible evaluations (Uganda Evaluation standards, 2011).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Nabbumba et al., (2013) in the *Uganda Evaluation standards* noted that the country has nascent technical evaluation capacity that has to be nurtured. The commissioners of evaluations and evaluators both have capacity inadequacies. However, Naidoo & Jannuzzi (2014) in the *UNDP Evaluation capacities* noted that commissioners and clients do not operate alone either. They play a role in organizations, which have a purpose, a way of working and, sometimes, strategic aims in their evaluation work. Evaluations may be conducted using established evaluation systems or procedures, for example, for ways of developing terms of reference or finding and hiring evaluators. Thus, credibility not only depends on the quality and independence of the evaluators, but also on the institutions and systems where these evaluations are conceived, planned and managed. Hauge (2003) in his paper *Evaluation Capacity Development* concluded that what Uganda needs is not more, but better, M&E. Rather than volume of M&E activity, what matters is the quality of M&E and practices in funnelling managers' attention toward a clear and coherent understanding of what difference they do or can make to national development.

Therefore despite the desire for quality evaluations at global and national levels, not much scientific inquiry has been done to explore how institutional/organisational factors affect evaluation quality, for proper remedial strategies, hence the proposed research.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The study seeks to examine how institutional factors affect the quality of project evaluations in Non-government organisations.

1.4 Objectives of the study

- 1 To establish the influence of management and leadership strength on the quality of project evaluation.
- 2 To investigate the influence of staff competence and capacity on the quality of project evaluation.
- 3 To examine the influence of resource management on the quality of project evaluation.

1.5 Research questions

- 1 In what ways does management and leadership strength influence the quality of project evaluation?
- 2 How does staff competence and capacity influence the quality of project evaluation?
- 3 How does resource management affect the quality of project evaluation?


1.6 Hypotheses of the study

- 1 Management and leadership strength can influence the quality of evaluation.
- 2 Staff competence and capacity has an influence on the quality of project evaluation.
- 3 Resource management affects the quality of project evaluation.

1.7 Conceptual framework on institutional factors and project quality

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE (IV)

Institutional Factors



DEPENDENT VARIABLE (DV)

Project Evaluation Quality




Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

Source: Adopted and modified from Serge & Victor (2009)

1.8 Justification of the study

This study will particularly help the implementing NGO's staff, donor agencies, M&E consultants/officers and project managers to better understand the level and nature of influence that institutional factors have on the quality project evaluations, why it is important and how to overcome quality challenges to be able to meet the expectations of the stakeholders, as well as provide valuable information for future evaluations. It will inform policies towards setting up of monitoring and evaluation systems, and show how M&E can be used as a powerful management tool to improve the way organizations and stakeholders can achieve greater accountability and

transparency. The study is therefore beneficial to NGOs, donor agencies, project managers and project management students who are involved in the designing and execution of project evaluations. Although this study will look at the challenges to quality evaluations for donor funded projects, it is also relevant in areas of M&E systems strengthening and the study will contribute to the body of knowledge. This is because it can be used as a reference material by researchers. The study will also identify areas related to M&E field that will require more research.

1.9 Scope of the study

The study will be conducted within Kampala which is the capital city of Uganda and is where the headquarters of FHI360 are situated.

The study will look at institutional factors that influence the quality of project evaluations at FHI360-Uganda and it will specifically look at leadership strength, evaluation staff competence and resource management factors in the institution.

It will involve FHI360 projects implemented and evaluated between 2000 and 2014.

1.10 Significance of the study

The results of this study are expected to be of value to the following:

Employees: The findings of the study are likely to enlighten employees of the key factors that play a significant role in ensuring the quality of evaluations in the project management process.

Administration: The information gathered in this study could be utilized by administration of FHI360-Uganda and donors to know where the major weaknesses lie in ensuring quality

evaluations in project management process in terms of why despite the heavy funding no significant impact to communities is realised.

Policy makers: As individuals charged with formulating policies especially at ministry level, their understanding of the role of having quality project evaluation process remains a key task to them in order to improve service delivery in the organizations. Therefore, findings from this study may help them in formulation of better policies that encourage improvement in service delivery in the country. The policy makers may review their decisions on how best they can involve necessary bodies in the struggle to improve service delivery in Uganda.

Researchers: The issues raised in this study are likely to lead to the involvement of various researchers in generating more knowledge from various perspectives. The findings of this study could form a basis for further research to those interested in finding more on how institutional factors influence the quality of evaluation in the project process.

Definition of key terms

Monitoring and Evaluation; this is the process of systematically collecting and analysing information of ongoing project and comparison of the project outcome/impact against the project intentions.

Project Management; It is a scientific application of modern tools and techniques in planning, financing, implementation, controlling and coordination of activities in order to achieve desired outputs according to the project objectives within the constraints of time and cost.

Institutional factors; These are organisational internal management factors that may influence the way in which the project is carried out monitored and evaluated.

Evaluation capacity development; This refers to the institutional, human, resource, skill and procedural base for conducting evaluations.

A quality Evaluation; is one that provides reliable, credible and useful evidence to strengthen accountability for development results or contribute to learning processes, or both

Quality; in evaluation, it relates to the ability to meet the minimum standards as defined in the evaluation guidelines

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the review of literature related to the topic of study. The purpose of the review is to examine institutional factors that influence evaluation quality in project management. The review is presented according to the objectives of the study and a theoretical frame work.

Theoretical Review

The study will be guided by goals based theory-program theory (Tyler, 1940) which is the classic model on program evaluation and organizational evaluation where results are assessed only in relation to the predetermined goals. The evaluator closely scrutinizes the object of evaluation in relation to its goals (Hansen 2005). Goals in this approach include objectives, performance targets and expected outcomes. The goals-based approach to evaluation was developed by Tyler in the late 1940s and has continued to evolve since. The key strength of this model is the determination of whether results align with goals. The degree of alignment between goals and results is important to know from accountability and improvement perspectives. Cameron (1986) argues that using the goal-attainment model is only possible and useful if the goals of the evaluated object are clear, if there is consensus about them, and if they are time-bound and measurable. However, this approach disregards side effects and unanticipated effects, it does not consider costs and the relevance of the goals is not questioned (Mickwitz, 2003). The approach does not question whether the chosen goals or targets are valid or appropriate measures of effectiveness. If this approach is seen as equivalent to an outcome or summative evaluation,

underlying mechanisms and process questions might be ignored. Policy makers and evaluators are often interested in the unintended consequences or outcomes of a policy, programme or project. These unintended outcomes may be beneficial or harmful.

In this, focus is only on concrete goals or effects related to a specific intervention or organization, and aims to evaluate the results of these, the goal theory model opens up the underlying black box of the goal theory, uncovers mechanisms and raises the focus to a cluster of interventions or to an organizational field. The aim of the goal theory model is to revise and further develop goal theory and thus learn what works for whom in which contexts (Hansen 2005). Evaluators often start out by clarifying a program aims, objectives and the desired outcomes, but theory-based approaches suggest that evaluators also go on to elicit the key assumptions and linkages underlying how a program has been designed, that is understanding the logic of how the program is supposed to operate to achieve the desired outcomes (Sullivan et al., 2007)

The logic model of the program/goal used in evaluation is viewed as an integration frame of various methods of data collection and interpretation, as integrated form of carrying out the methodological triangulation, of sources and evaluator, of construction the quantitative samples (Cojocar, 2007) or qualitative ones (Cojocar, 2007). The program theory is useful because, it guides evaluation by identifying the key elements of the program, clarifying how these elements are planned in order to be connected to each other (Cooksy, Gill and Kelly, 2001).

Institutional leadership strength and project evaluation quality

The stakeholder support as reflected in their leadership support towards a project management process significantly determines the quality of a project evaluation activity. Diallo and Thuillier (2005) assert that the ability of the stakeholders to effectively enforce the available rules and regulations in the project evaluation process is important towards evaluation success. This is achieved through effective communication through different stakeholders. Communication and trust between project supervisors and project coordinator influence project success (Ika et al. (2010)

The involvement of all stakeholders like project managers, team members, funding and implementing agencies, target beneficiaries, and the general public to effectively supervise the evaluation process may greatly influence the evaluation process. The success of this phase has a carry-over effect on the next one and that effective consultation with stakeholders proves to be the most influential factor on project management success and more important than the competency of project supervisors and managers (Bamberger & Michael, 2009).

The quality of any project evaluation is very linked to the level of participation of key stakeholders in the project or programme and as such, where stakeholders have been side-lined, the quality is always questionable. Participatory evaluation is a partnership approach to evaluation in which stakeholders actively engage in developing the evaluation and all phases of its implementation. Those who have the most at stake in the program, partners, program beneficiaries, funders and key decision makers, play active roles. Participation occurs throughout the evaluation process including: Identifying relevant questions, planning the evaluation design, selecting appropriate measures and data collection methods, gathering and analysing data (Zukoski & Luluquisen 2002)

Stakeholder involvement improves downward as well as horizontal and vertical accountability and is very critical and important today. As earlier noted, this is most obvious in recent discussions of ‘empowering evaluations’ where evaluation is seen as a process through which marginal and disempowered groups are able to gain skills and influence through their involvement in evaluation (Fetterman and Wanderson, 2004; Fetterman et al., 1996; Holte-McKenzie et al., 2006; Schnoes et al., 2000). It is also apparent in the changing ways in which ‘accountability’ is defined. No more is it simply a matter of accountability to donors, but also of downward accountability to beneficiaries.

Transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders are essential at all stages of the evaluation process. Involvement of and consultation with stakeholders facilitates consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations; it also heightens the credibility and quality of the evaluation. (UNIDO, 2006)

The leadership strength reflected in their ability to offer effective supervision of the ongoing evaluation process remains crucial towards project success. This is largely emphasized in the consultation during strategy development Support program staff in framing evaluation priorities, questions, sequencing, and methods (Carvalho et al, 2004)

Appropriate leadership helps to guide the evaluation staff on key guidelines that are more likely to lead to attainment of high results. To ensure this management can spearhead an internal evaluation program for staff that are leading evaluation efforts in their teams and want to share and deepen their skills and knowledge. This may also work through debriefs of evaluation program staff by assessing what went well, what didn’t, key lessons, and actions taken as a

result. Synthesize and share relevant lessons with other program staff so they can benefit from promising practice and lessons learned (Rogers & Patricia, 2009)

Effective leadership with supervision modes can help project managers to effectively control the achievement of the project objectives. Utilising the existing organisational structures and resources, it seeks to manage the project by applying a collection of tools and techniques, without adversely disturbing the routine operation of the company (Kerzner, 2009). The function of project management includes defining the requirement of work, establishing the extent of work, allocating the resources required, planning the execution of the work, monitoring the progress of the work and adjusting deviations from the plan.

Successful project management requires leaders to fully plan in the guidelines available for evaluation with a commitment to complete the project, careful appointment of a skilled project manager; spending time to define the project adequately, correctly planning the activities in the project; ensuring correct and adequate information flows, changing activities to accommodate frequent changes on dynamic, accommodating employees' personal goals with performance and rewards and making a fresh start when mistakes in implementation have been identified (Cash & Fox, 2012). However a project may still be successful despite the failings of project management because it meets the higher and long-term objectives. At the point when the project management is completed, the short-term orientation could be one of failure but the long-term outcome could be a success, because the larger set of objectives are satisfied instead of the narrow subset which constitutes project management.

Staff competencies and project evaluation quality

Staff competencies in project evaluation process significantly determine evaluation quality in the long run of project management process. Skills matter for evaluators who are in the position of determining what works and what doesn't, and who have the responsibility to help guide the institutions we work for toward practices that will yield the best results, professional competency is a must. Yet, the evaluation family has struggled for years now with the challenge of establishing a broadly agreed upon professional profile for evaluation practitioners (Baker et al, 2004).

The expertise of key evaluation team in the evaluation process enables staff to effectively identify key issues that will enable a functional evaluation process like setting up of the M&E system, implementation of the M&E system, involvement of the project stakeholders, and communication of the M&E results (Guijt et al., 2002). Experienced staff member is able to know that an ideal M&E system should be independent enough to be externally credible and socially legitimate, but not so independent to lose its relevance' (Briceno, 2010). It should therefore be able to influence policy making from recommendations of lessons learned from evaluations conducted as well as be sustainable overtime for it to be responsive to the needs of the stakeholders.

The quality of the evaluation is determined by competence of the staff involved in the evaluation process in terms of the training and experience. This allows to get effective results that attach value to the evaluation process. Evaluation is an important tool that organizations can use to demonstrate its accountability, improve its performance, increase its abilities for obtaining funds or future planning, and fulfil the organizational objectives. By communicating the results of the

evaluation, your organization can inform its staff, board of directors, service users, funders, the public, or other stakeholders about the benefits and effectiveness of your organization's services and programs, and explain how charities work and how they are monitored (Rogers & Patricia 2009).

A quality evaluation with competent staff results into good information for the organization to make effective decisions. Information derived from project evaluations can be used to serve many purposes. A successful project evaluation may therefore be measured by the utilization of the information got from it (Briceno, 2010). Monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of the project's design, implementation and completion (Chaplowe, 2008). It is useful to all projects, big or small, since information got from it enables better decision making by helping to identify project areas that are on target and those that need to be adjusted or replaced. Weaknesses in the project are indentified on time and collective measures taken (Gorgens et al., 2010).

Quality evaluations are as a result of skilled program and relevant operational staff responsible and accountable for designing, commissioning, and managing evaluations, as well as for using their results. Such competence helps to effectively meet standards of quality, relevance, and use. They may use a fully distributed model, with program officers responsible for their own evaluations, or they may designate a team member to lead evaluation efforts (White & Howard, 2008).

Competent staff members allow evaluations to use multiple methods to collect and analyze data. This process of triangulation allows one method to complement the weaknesses of another. Randomized experiments can determine whether a certain outcome can be attributed to an

intervention. But complementary qualitative methods are also needed to answer questions about how and why an intervention did or didn't work questions that are central to replication. Thus, as part of early planning, it is ideal to select methods that match evaluation questions (Woolcock, Michael, 2009).

Experienced staff members help to maximize rigor without compromising relevance. Part of maximizing rigor is reducing bias in the evaluation. While not all evaluations can feasibly be randomized so that we can definitely attribute impact to one or more interventions, the essence of good evaluation involves some comparison against expectations, over time, and across types of interventions, organizations, populations, or regions. Even when there is no formal counterfactual, it can be helpful to engage in thought experiments to challenge easy interpretations of data and consider alternative explanations. Multiple methods help reduce bias as does active consideration of how the methods are applied. For instance, if an advocacy initiative is being evaluated largely through qualitative interviews of key informants, it will be important to include respondents who are not cheerleaders, but may offer constructive critiques (Chen, 2004).

Competence allows staff members to connect all stages in the evaluation process. It is essential that Foundation staff engage with grantees about evaluation and communicate with them early and often about expectations. What is communicated and how will of course depend on the purpose of the evaluation and the grantee's role in it. At a grant's inception, program staff should inform grantees that they may be expected to participate in an evaluation, share data with the Foundation and evaluators, and potentially, if relevant, have the results shared with the field. It is

never a good idea to surprise grantees with an evaluation. Often this expectation needs to be communicated and reinforced several times (Chen, 2005).

Resource management and project evaluation quality

The quality of evaluations may be determined by resources available in the organization. The stringent measures for accountability in place may influence the nature of evaluations likely to be carried out. The transparency in financial and operational terms to funders and governments (upward accountability) may be coupled with heavy demands for accountability to beneficiaries and civil society more generally (downward accountability) and this may slow down the process of evaluation. Accountability and the practice of good governance is demanded, though, not only of NGOs and micro-finance institutions but also of local and national governments and multilateral institutions such as the World Bank. Less notable, so far, in the region is an explicit demand for the accountability of community-based enterprises, or indeed private sector businesses (Speckbacher et al, 2003).

Resource usage within the stipulated and planned time may also influence the quality of evaluation in the long run. The increasingly problematic issue of time requirements for marginalised social groups to be able to participate in M&E of any kind, and hence who can afford to become involved in a M&E process is also not being tackled by the literature, and presumably by the practice that it aims to document. This is of special concern to participatory M&E which by principle does not wish to offer payment so as to ensure a maximum of legitimacy for the judgment obtained at the end of the process (Chen, 2004).

In designing an M&E system and training can initially be costly and time consuming, it does not necessarily have to use vast time and financial resources in the long run. If beneficiary

community members are trained in self-monitoring or indicator measurement then the job and the (time) costs can be distributed. Also, as several commentators have noted, there are costs to not evaluating, in terms of failure to adjust projects and programmes with early signs of problems, and wasting resources on unnecessary or unproductive activities (Race to Save, 2009; Oakley, Pratt and Clayton, 1998).

Confusion of objectives can raise the cost of finishing some of the activities in the evaluation process. Because of lack of distinction between objectives are seen to be correlated. For example completion to budget might be placed alongside 'profitability' as objectives. Budget is primarily a project management issue, yet profitability is a project objective. To suggest that a client instigates a project just to see it completed to budget reduces the importance of the project objectives this may largely affect the evaluation process.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter presents the methodology that will be used to carry out the study. It presents the research design, study population, sample size, sampling methods, data collection methods and instruments, pretesting of instruments, procedure for data collection validity and reliability, data management and analysis, measurement of variables, ethical considerations and limitations of the study.

3.1 Research design

The study will utilize the cross-sectional survey design that will use both qualitative and quantitative approaches. With a cross sectional design, the researcher will study a group of people just one time, in a single session focusing on the topic of inquiry. Surveys are designed to provide a ‘snapshot’ of how things are at a specific time. In survey research, independent and dependent variables are used to define the scope of study (Nachmias, 1981). In this study, survey methodology will help in measuring variables and examining relationships as recommended by Fowler (1993). Cross sectional survey design will be adopted because it helps the researcher gather data from a sample of a wider population at a particular time and use such data to make inference about the wider population.

3.2 Study population

The study will be carried out in Kampala at the head offices of FHI360. The study population will include M&E staff, program managers and project officers.

3.3 Sample Size and selection.

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), it's impossible to study the whole targeted population and therefore the researcher has to decide on a sampled population. The sample size will be determined using Israel (1992) adopted from Yamane 1967 simplified formula as shown below.

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

Where n= sample size

N= population size

e= level of precision (0.05)

Table 1: Number of participants per category

Category	Population	Sample size	Sampling Strategy
Program managers	6	6	Purposive
M&E staff	12	12	Simple random sampling
Project officers	16	16	Simple random sampling
Total respondents	34	34	

3.4 Sampling Methods

The study will use simple random sampling to select M&E staff and project officers. Simple random sampling is a form of respondents' selection which is done in order to avoid bias (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). A list of project staff will be sought from the Human Resource Department to help in determining the respondents. Names of respondents of each category will be written on pieces of papers and contacted to be involved in the study.

The study will use purposive sampling to select program managers since they are specific and known in the organization, as such, key informant interviews and the questionnaire will be administered on them. The same will apply to the M&E officers.

3.5 Data Collection methods

The study will utilize both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Primary data will be obtained using questionnaires as well as interviews. Secondary data will be sourced from reading literature and existing records.

3.5.1 Quantitative methods

The questionnaire will be the method used to generate quantitative data.

Questionnaire method

This will involve the use of self-administered questionnaires to respondents in relation to institutional factors that influence evaluation quality in project management at FHI360. In seeking for quantitative data, closed ended questionnaires in a scale (five likert) form will be used. Questionnaire method will be used because it helps to investigate motives and feelings in likert scaling (Creswell, 1994).

3.5.2 Qualitative methods

To obtain qualitative data, interview and document review will be applied.

Interview method

The interview method will be used to explore which and how institutional factors influence evaluation quality in project management at FHI360, this will be given to program managers and M&E officers. This method will take the form of face to face interviews that will seek to provide the required data as specified above. Interview method will be used because it provides an excellent opportunity to probe and explore questions (Cress well 1994).

Document review method

A document review method will be used in sourcing for secondary data in all relevant documents in relation institutional factors that influence project evaluation quality. These will be sourced from journals, text books, evaluation reports and other relevant reliable sources.

3.6 Data collection instruments

Data collection instruments will include questionnaires, interview guide and the document review checklist.

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The study will use a five-likert scale questionnaire which will be administered to project managers, M&E staff members and project officers. The study will have one set of questionnaire that will be constructed strategically to capture all the necessary information from all categories of respondents in respect to the themes of the study and a total of 10 questions will be developed for purposes of intensive analysis of the three research objectives. The questionnaire will be administered door to door for self-administration since all the respondents are known. The likert scale will be used since they are very flexible and can be constructed more easily than most other types of attitude scales (Amin, 2005).

3.6.2 Interview guide

Face to face interviews with the help of an interview guide will be conducted among project managers and selected M&E officers to establish views on the topic under study. The researcher believes that these people can provide rich information in regard to the study because they are at the heart of commissioning project evaluations and manage project resources. Interviews will be used, since they are appropriate in providing in-depth data, data required to meet specific objectives, allows clarity in questioning and quite flexible compared to questionnaires.

3.6.3 Document review checklist

The study will also carry out reviews of existing documents primarily the evaluation reports and survey reports as well as project reports, management reports, strategic plans, minutes and data by other scholars in relation to institutional factors that influence quality of evaluation. This will give an overview of how much has been addressed by FHI360 in this line.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

The data a collection tools will be pretested on a smaller number of respondents from each category of the population to ensure that the questions will be accurate and clear in line with each objective of the study thus ensuring validity and reliability.

3.7.1 Validity

The study will adopt content validity which is the degree to which data collected using particular instruments represents a specific domain of indicators or content of a particular concept. Validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on research results. It is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomenon understudy. Therefore validity looks at how accurately represented are the variables of the study (Mugenda, Mugenda 2003). To ensure content validity of instruments the researcher will construct the instruments with all the items that measure variables of the study. The researcher will also consult the supervisor for proper guidance after which the researcher will pre-test the instruments and after pre-testing ambiguous questions will be removed or polished so as to remain with the finest data required.

3.7.2 Reliability

The study will adopt Cronbach coefficient reliability test. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), Reliability refers to the measure of the degree to which research instruments yields

consistent results after repeated trials. If the coefficient is 0.7 and more as recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), the instrument will be considered reliable.

3.8 Procedure for data Collection

The researcher will obtain a letter of introduction from UTAMU to help with introductions to various respondents. After the construction of instruments the researcher will take them for approval to the supervisor and there after they will be taken for pretesting in selected few respondents. The researcher will carry out a pilot run on a participating group in the study. Pretesting will be done by picking 10 respondents and giving them the same approved questionnaires. Pretesting helps to know whether respondents interpret phrases and questions as the researcher wants them, it also helps to obtain a general assessment of respondents' ability to perform required tasks (e.g. recall relevant information, estimate frequency of specific behaviors, etc.) and will also help to obtain ideas for question wording in case rephrasing of the original statements is needed.

3.9 Data Management and Analysis

In the study, the instruments that will be used will yield both qualitative and quantitative data. After respondents have answered questionnaires and interviews, raw data will be cleaned, sorted and condensed into systematically comparable data. Univariate data analysis will be done using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS), which will help to summarize the coded data and produce the required statistics in the study.

3.9.1 Quantitative data

In handling all the objectives of the study, the researcher will use a computer package SPSS where data will be entered, edited, cleaned and sorted. This program will be used to do univariate and bi-variate analysis. Uni-variate analysis of these objectives will be used to obtain descriptive

data in form of means and standard deviations since it will be a five likert questionnaire and this will help give the general response towards each question in the likert scale through the mean values. In establishing the relationships among variables, bivariate, multivariate analysis in form of correlation and regression analysis where necessary will be used to ascertain the magnitude of effect the dependent variable has on independent variable. In correlation and regression analysis, the level of significance will be, $P=0.05$.

3.9.2 Qualitative data

Thematic data analysis of qualitative data in the three objectives of the study will use content analysis where each piece of work answered in the interview guide will be read through thoroughly to identify themes where it belongs.

3.10 Measurement of variables.

The independent variable in the study will be institutional factors and dependent variable will be evaluation quality. The nominal scale will be used in the measurement of variables in a likert scale format which will range from 1 to 5, strongly disagree, disagree, not sure, agree and strongly agree respectively.

References

- Ahsan, K., Gunawan, I., (2010). **Analysis of cost and schedule performance of international development projects**. International Journal of Project Management 28 (1), 68–78.
- Baker, B N, Fisher, D and Murphy, D C (2004). **Factors affecting project success National Technical Information Services**, N-74-30092.
- Bamberger, Michael (2009). **Strengthening the evaluation of program effectiveness through reconstructing baseline data**. Journal of Development Effectiveness 1(1): 37-59.
- Carvalho, Soniya and Howard White (2004). **Theory-based evaluation**. The case of social funds' American Journal of Evaluation 25(2) 141-60.
- Cash, H and Fox R., (2012). **Elements of successful project management**. Systems Management (1992) 10-12.
- Chen, H.T., (2004). **Theory-driven evaluations**. Need, difficulties, and options", American journal of evaluation, 15(1), pp. 79-82.
- Chen, H.T., (2005). **Practical program evaluation**. Assessing and improving planning, implementation and effectiveness, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Cojocar, S., (2007). **Strategies for qualitative samples used in program evaluation**. vol. 16, pp. 138-151.
- Diallo, A., Thuillier, D., (2004). **The success dimensions of international development projects**. The perceptions of African project coordinators. International Journal of Project Management 22 (1), 19–31.
- Hauge, A., (2003). **Evaluation Capacity Development**. Building Country Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector: Selected Lessons of International Experience pp. 9

Ika, L.A., (2009). **Project success as a topic in project management journals.** Project Management Journal 40 (4), 6–19.

Jugdev, K., Müller, R., (2005). **A retrospective look at our evolving understanding of project success.** Project Management Journal 36 (4), 19–31.

Karkara, N (2013). **Advocating for Evaluation.** A toolkit to develop advocacy strategies to strengthen an enabling environment for evaluation pp 14 - 16

Kerzner, H (2009). **Project management.** A systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.

Morairu, J., Pankaj, V., (2012). **State of evaluation.** Evaluation Practice and Capacity in the Nonprofit Sector pp. 12

Pinto, J.K., Slevin, D.P., (2008). **Critical success factors across the project life cycle.** Project Management Journal 19 (3), 67–74.

Reed E., Morairu, J., (2010). **State of evaluation.** Evaluation Practice and Capacity in the Nonprofit Sector pp. 17

Rogers, Patricia (2009). **Matching impact evaluation design to the nature of the intervention and the purpose of the evaluation.** Journal of Development Effectiveness 1(3).

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H., and Lipsey, M. W (2004). **Program Evaluation.** A Systematic Approach. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Speckbacher, G, Bischof, J, Pfeiffer T (2003). **A descriptive analysis on the implementation of Balanced Scorecards in German-speaking countries.** Management Accounting Research, 14(4), 361-388.

Stufflebeam Daniel L (2002). **Institutionalizing Evaluation Checklist**. Evaluation Checklists Project, University of Michigan.

Stufflebeam, D., (2011). **Evaluation models**. New directions for evaluation, nr. 89, pp. 7-98.

Sullivan, TM, Strachan, M, Timmons, BK7 (200). **Guide to Monitoring and Evaluating Health Information Products and Services**: Baltimore, Maryland: Center for Communication Programs, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; Washington, D.C.: Constella Futures; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Management Sciences for Health.

White, Howard (2008). **Of Probits and Participation**. The use of mixed methods in quantitative impact evaluation” IDS Bulletin.

Woolcock, Michael (2009). **Toward a plurality of methods in project evaluation**. A contextualised approach to understanding impact trajectories and efficacy’ Journal of Development Effectiveness **1**(1): 1-14.

Appendix I – Data collection instruments

Institutional/organizational factors affecting the quality of project evaluation in NGOs in Uganda. A case study of FHI360 Uganda Office.

Instructions: Select one option for each question, and tick the option selected

Management and leadership strength

1. The ability to put in place and enforce evaluation guidelines and standard operating procedures influences the effectiveness, reliability and credibility of the evaluation (*evaluator recruitment procedures, unbiased selection process*)

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2. The level and extent of activity monitoring and supervision in institutions largely affects the reliability and credibility of project evaluations in non-government organizations.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3. The nature and level of participation, and support of all key project stakeholders including beneficiaries in evaluation activities has an effect on the effectiveness, reliability and credibility of the project evaluation

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

4. The presence/existence of a functional in-house, independent institutional review board has an effect on the quality of project evaluations with in an organization.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Staff competence and capacity

5. The quality of the evaluation is determined by competence of the staff involved in the evaluation process in terms of the training and experience.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

6. Skilled program and relevant operational staff responsible and accountable for designing, commissioning and managing evaluations, as well as for using their results have a great influence on the quality of evaluations in NGOs?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

7. The nature of Evaluation terms of reference has a great effect on the eventual quality of evaluation in non-government organizations.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Resource management

8. Resource availability and allocation within institutions influences the quality of project evaluations in non-governmental organizations in Uganda.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

9. Resource usage within the stipulated and planned time may also influence the quality of evaluation in the long run.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

10. Failure to adjust projects and programmes with early signs of problems, and wasting resources on unnecessary or unproductive activities affects the quality of project evaluation

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Key informant interview guide

Management and leadership strength

- a) How does putting in place and enforcing evaluation guidelines as well as evaluation standard operating procedures influence the effectiveness, reliability and credibility of the evaluation? (The guidelines include having clear evaluator recruitment procedures, unbiased selection etc.)
- b) In what ways does the level and extent of activity monitoring and supervision in institutions/organizations affect the reliability and credibility of project evaluations in non-government organizations?
- c) How does the nature and level of involvement, and support of all key project stakeholders including beneficiaries affect the effectiveness, reliability and credibility of the project evaluation? (Stakeholders are involved at designing evaluation, as respondents/beneficiaries, other organizations working in the same sector, local authorities etc.)
- d) In what ways does the existence of a functional in-house, independent institutional review board affect the quality of project evaluations within an organization?

Staff competence and capacity

- a) In what ways does competence of the staff involved in the evaluation process in terms of the training and experience influence the credibility and reliability of project evaluation? (Selecting appropriate methods, designing the evaluation including TORs, and specialized training).
- b) In what ways do skilled program and relevant operational staff responsible and accountable for designing, commissioning and managing evaluations, as well as for using their results influence the quality of evaluations in NGOs? (in terms of quality, relevance and use)
- c) In what ways does the nature/quality of Evaluation terms of reference affect the eventual quality of project evaluation in non-government organizations

Resource management

- a) How does resource availability and allocation within institutions influence the quality of project evaluation in non-governmental organizations in Uganda?
- b) How does resource usage within the stipulated and planned time influence the quality of evaluation in the long run?
- c) In what ways does failure to adjust projects and programmes with early signs of problems, and wasting resources on unnecessary or unproductive activities affect the quality of project evaluation?