The state of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) as a discipline in Africa

From infancy to adulthood?

B C Basheka
Uganda Technology and Management University
Uganda

A Byamugisha
Uganda Technology and Management University
Uganda

ABSTRACT

Since the early 1990s, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has seen a steep climb within Africa–in terms of practice, profession and academic study. As a field of practice, specialised departments housing the practitioners now exist and the demand for evaluation of policies, projects, programmes and interventions remains on the increase. Legal and institutional frameworks for the practices of M&E are still weak. As a profession, over 30 national evaluation associations under the umbrella body – the African Evaluation Association (AFREA) are in existence. As an academic field of study several universities now offer programmes in M&E; notwithstanding the focus and locus dilemma regarding the discipline. Scholarship regarding the state of the field is thus of utmost importance to coherently describe the 'ups and downs' of the new field which has become a 'grown up child' having jumped the infancy stage. This article examines four interrelated questions: How has the M&E field evolved in Africa and what local and global forces have been behind this evolution? Is M&E a discipline of study? What precisely is the state of the M&E discipline in African universities? What is the future of M&E in Africa? Answers to these questions will provide useful insights into the muddy waters of the new discipline which has persistently been claimed by several other disciplines within public discourses.

INTRODUCTION

This article provides an overview of how the M&E field developed in Africa and it also discusses the local and global forces that provided momentum to this development. The

article begins with a conceptual debate on the terminologies of M&E and provides the context in which these terminologies are used in Africa. The article investigates the current state of the M&E discipline in African universities and contextualises the locus and focus before the article turns to the trends and future direction of the teaching of the field.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

According to Auriacombe (2013:717), "…in order to gain a better understanding of what evaluation is all about it is necessary to look into the historical background of evaluation research (cf. also Auriacombe 2009:161). Globally, the international status of M&E research remains theoretically and methodologically influenced by the American tradition. The United States (US) is regarded as the motherland of the field in terms of its trends, number of authors and their academic and professional influence, degree of professionalisation, focus of academic programmes, legislation and institutionalisation of evaluation, development of models and approaches for evaluation, evaluation capacity building initiatives, evaluation standards and guiding principles, number and attendees of evaluation conferences and workshops, publications and their impact factor, guides and evaluation handbooks. The American Evaluation Association (AEA) for example remains the most dominant evaluation society in the world with membership that has grown from just over 3000 members in 2001 to approximately 7000 by mid-2015. The association has members from every state in the US and in more than 60 foreign countries. In October 2005, AEA together with the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) held a joint meeting in Toronto where some 2500 evaluation practitioners assisted in four days with more than 525 concurrent sessions dealing with evaluation themes and issues.

Stockman and Meyer (2013:26) submit that the development of theoretical and methodological approaches and models in evaluation research is often dominated by American authors. Their training programmes for evaluators have expanded to cover the non-university sectors with many schools, state institutions, companies and different national professional associations offering such courses. Other countries however, equally have noticeable developments regarding evaluation. In Europe, professionalisation of evaluation has progressed to different levels across countries with Sweden, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, Norway, France and Finland currently topping the list. Recent rankings further point to impressive developments of the field in Switzerland, Japan, Spain, Italy, Israel and Africa. In 2011, the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE) identified 117 evaluation associations, 96 of which were national organisations located in 78 different countries. By 2013, the number had increased to 145 (IOCE 2013:2 and BaTall 2009:7).

In Africa, the oldest evaluation association was established in 1997 in Ghana, while the African Evaluation association was itself established in 1999 with the heyday period of intense professional associations reported between 2000 and 2004. Domestic and global forces played a role in this growth. Globally, Mertens and Russon (2000:275) proclaim that the emergence of many new regional and national organisations illustrated the growing worldwide recognition of the importance of evaluation. Before 1995 there existed only five regional and/or national evaluation organisations in the world but by 2000 there were

more than 30 - a 500% increase in a 5-year period. Much of this growth was occurring in developing countries, particularly in Africa (p. 275). Malefetsane, Lungepi and Tembile (2014:5) educate us that in Africa, evaluation has been on the increase; a trend predicted to continue especially with political recognition of the utility of evaluation to good governance. De Kool and Van Buuren (2004:173) conceded that the rise to New Public Management (NPM) which was constructed around key philosophies that emphasised outputs and outcomes, transparency and accountability, created a demand for M&E in Africa.

NPM was intended to overcome the shortcomings of public sector administration through the adoption of market-based operations, private sector values and techniques of management as well as through changing the role of government from acting as the principal vehicle for socio-economic development to guiding and facilitating that development (Chani 2013:12). NPM was characterised by accent on results both in planning and in evaluation of programmes and people, service to the public with a special concern for quality, citizens as clients, delegation of authority as close as possible to the level of action and empowerment of employees, greater attention to cost through comprehensive auditing, contracting out, and introduction of competition, as well as private sector techniques for motivating employees such as merit pay, mission statements and quality circles (Dwivedi and Williams 2011:31). The shift toward more performance measurement and quantification led to an increased interest in measuring the worth of policies, projects, programmes or various interventions. M&E as a result grew in popularity among the developed countries to determine how policies, projects, programmes and interventions were working or not working.

Dabelstein (2003:365) avers that while evaluation institutions exist in many developing countries, most have little impact on policy and management decisions due to the lack of demand: credible evaluation is a function of good governance, i.e. demand for accountability more than of institutionalisation of evaluation and/or professional capacity. Matsiliza (2012:67) recently demonstrated how the process of policy evaluation and monitoring; if well undertaken; could promote political and administrative accountability in the public sector in addition to measuring performance and efficiency of different interventions. Despite this utility Khan (1998:315) reports how some parts of the developing world, such as Africa, find themselves with top political leadership who are unaware of the benefits of M&E. This perception sounds plausible and most academics in public administration equally lack a thorough understanding of the field itself.

Toulemonde (1999:157) supports reinforcing an evaluation culture through intense and sustained communication about evaluation. This in itself centres around deliberate efforts on capacity building. He argues that developing and implementing evaluation activities, processes, structures, and systems that sustain high-quality evaluation practice needs to remain vibrant activities. M&E systems however, are not easy to introduce and sustain (Khan 1998:324). Meanwhile, Dabelstein (2003:369) rightly reminds us that when evaluation capacity is judged to be insufficient, activities should be carried out simultaneously to support the development of the necessary capacity in countries where the need has been identified. The role of universities in building the needed evaluation capacities becomes necessary in this context. Unfortunately, few publications exist on the continent devoted to tracking the journey of the field yet it is the kind of story that needs to be told from an African point of view and by Africans. Politicians, academics, students and practitioners need a coherent description of how the field has evolved and where it is headed. According

to Auriacombe (2013:717), "…in order to gain a better understanding of what evaluation is all about it is necessary to look into the historical background of evaluation research (cf. also Auriacombe 2009:161).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND CONTEXT

Conceptually, M&E is widely used in African discourses unlike international literature where evaluation or programme evaluation is used. Patton (2003:90) observed the confusion relating to the definition of M&E. In its ordinary usage, monitoring means observing the progress of an intervention and is continuous. Evaluation is an activity that judges the worth (Scriven 2007:7); and builds on monitoring although it can also feed into monitoring. Evaluation assesses the value or worth of a programme (Farell *et al.* 2002:8) and it relates to a set of research questions and methods geared to reviewing processes, activities and strategies for the purpose of improving them in order to achieve better results (Kahan & Goodstadt 2005:11). Patton (2008:3) cautions how evaluation is different from research. Auriacombe (2013:716) states that, "Various attempts have been made to classify evaluation methods. Although these attempts were aimed at simplifying the confusing array of available methods they tend to further confuse our understanding of the evaluation field".

Stockman (2011:14) suggests that evaluation in its general form should be regarded as an assessment or judgement of a circumstance or object on the basis of information. The information is gathered, analysed and assessed for a specific end, namely to make a decision. This assessment is a systematic investigation of the worth of a programme or project for the purpose of reducing uncertainty in decision making (Mertens 1998:219). It uses social research techniques for assessing how an intervention was conceived, formulated, legitimised or approved, implemented and whether the intended purpose has been attained. Evaluation should be regarded as the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results (OECD 2002:5).

Contextually, M&E is used from three strands. Firstly, as a field of practice whose origin is as old as mankind. Stockman (2011:14) in support of this view states that "the meaning associated with the term evaluation can be retraced well back into the history of mankind. If for example someone tried roasted meat to see if it tasted better than raw meat and whether or not it was more easily digestible, or if someone set out to discover whether certain fungi or plants were edible or not, or if the work that needed to be done could be carried out more easily and more precisely with one tool than with another, he was in fact conducting a simple form of evaluation". In the modern usage of the term, the term practice implies that the field attracts people to work in it on a full-time basis to earn a living. Such people are in government departments of M&E, civil society organisations, consultancy and academia.

Secondly, M&E is used as a profession. Stufflebeam and Coryn (2014:6) regard it as a distinct profession and defend how evaluation is supportive of all other professions and in turn is supported by many of them arguing that in fact no profession could excel without evaluation. Services and research can lead to progress and stand up to public and professional scrutiny only if they are regularly subjected to rigorous evaluation and shown to be sound. Also, improvement-oriented self-evaluation is a hallmark of professionalism.

Programme leaders and all members of any profession are obligated to serve their clients well. This requires that they regularly evaluate, improve, and are accountable for their contributions. In the sense of assessing and improving quality and meeting accountability requirements, all professions (including evaluation) are dependent on evaluation. *Wikipedia* defines a **profession** as a vocation founded upon specialised educational training, the purpose of which is to supply disinterested objective counsel and service to others, for a direct and definite compensation, wholly apart from expectation of other business gain. Major milestones which mark an occupation being identified as a profession include the following:

- an occupation becomes a full-time occupation
- the establishment of a training school
- the establishment of a university school (department)
- the establishment of a local association
- the establishment of a national association
- the introduction of codes of professional ethics
- the establishment of state licensing laws

Thirdly, M&E is an academic discipline. Unlike other disciplines however, evaluation is still young and is often claimed by several other disciplines. Evaluation draws concepts, criteria, and methods from such other fields as philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology, anthropology, education, economics, communication, public administration, information technology, statistics, and measurement. Clearly it is important for evaluators to recognise and build on the symbiotic relationships between evaluation and other fields of study and practice (Stufflebeam and Coryn 2014:6).

The three strands of M&E sometimes brings about the 'chicken-egg dilemma'. There is hardly any science of what comes first. The academic study for example can propel practitioners to form professional associations. The professionalisation efforts on the other hand can encourage new entrants into the evaluation profession and because such entrants lack academic qualifications their desire for academic qualifications is fulfilled by universities establishing courses of study. This seems to have been the case in Africa. When the practices need to be documented and a common body of knowledge developed (models, principles, theories and concepts of evaluation), scholars take an important role in this endeavour. This in effect calls for the blending of theory and practice.

EVOLUTION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN AFRICA

Preskill and Boyle (2008:1) regard the first decade of the 21st century as the years that marked an important evolutionary stage in the evaluation profession's history. This section of the article examines those forces responsible for the growth of M&E in Africa. The main body to have globally set the agenda for greater professionalism in evaluation was the Expert Group on Evaluation of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) created in 1982 and it subsequently became the DAC Working Party on Evaluation. In March 1987 a conference organised by DAC to give donors and beneficiaries the opportunity to discuss evaluation provided an

important pioneering work for evaluation in Africa. It discussed and documented the dire capacity gaps that bewildered developing countries; Africa inclusive.

Within Africa, the Abidjan seminar of May 1990 whose objectives included clarification of evaluation needs as perceived by the countries themselves and designing modalities of strengthening self-evaluation capacity was the next important milestone in the evolution of evaluation. This was moving side by side with the global developments. Mertens and Russon (2000:276) reports on the November 1995 American Evaluation Association (AEA) and the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) cosponsored an international conference in Vancouver, British Columbia whose theme was *Evaluation for a New Century—A Global Perspective* which set the agenda for revolutionalising evaluation in other countries including Africa. Delegates were from 50 countries throughout Africa, Asia, Australia, Central America, Europe, New Zealand, and South America. The conference provided up-to-date and relevant information in a variety of sectors and after the conference several national evaluation organisations were born.

In 1997, a discussion on EVALTALK, the AEA-sponsored listserv, about the international nature of the evaluation profession (Mertens and Russon 2000:276) took place. The creation of national evaluation organisations was a major topic of discussion. In 1998 during the AEA conference a further debate relating to the creation of a worldwide evaluation community was undertaken. The organisations represented on the discussion panel were American Evaluation Association (AEA), Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), the Associazione Italiana de Valutazione (AIV), the Australasian Evaluation Society (AES), the Kenyan Evaluation Association (KenEA), and United Kingdom Evaluation Society (UKES). The proceedings of the panel were published in a document entitled *Creating a worldwide evaluation community* although the panel cautioned about the need to move slowly with this initiative due to diversity issues raised by participants.

Within Africa, a second Abidjan conference was held in 1998 involving officials from 12 African countries and 21 international development assistance agencies to deliberate on M&E. Participants acknowledged that M&E capacity development was an integral part of a more extensive initiative for good governance and effective public resources management. Institutional support at the continental level, and more training in evaluation designs, methodologies and practices, were considered fundamental to any efforts aimed at strengthening M&E capacity on the continent. Participants recommended establishing various databases, including one of evaluators (practitioners, consultants, officials in charge of M&E, bodies of inspectors and auditors, and private sector firms) who would form the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA). Establishing a database for collecting lessons learned and examples of good practice in M&E was also agreed upon. Shortly after this conference, AfrEA was launched.

In September 1999, the inaugural AfrEA Conference attended by over 300 evaluators from 35 countries was convened in Nairobi-Kenya under the auspices of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) with the assistance of the Kenya Evaluation Association, the Kenyan Graduate Mobilization Programme, African Development Bank, CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Family Health International, United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Habitat. Financial support was received from the African Development Bank, Danish International Development Agency, International Development Research Center (Canada), the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and UNICEF. The conference

committed to developing indigenous evaluation capacity through providing high-level training throughout Africa by means of national professional associations and peer-to-peer training. In a longer-term, it was expected that evaluation associations would collaborate with their governments to create national evaluation policies and capacities.

On February 18–20, 2000, the WK Kellogg Foundation (WKKF) supported a residency meeting held in Barbados, West Indies. Represented were all of the organisations from the association Presidents Panel plus AfrEA, la Asociació n Centroamericana de Evaluacion (ACE), the European Evaluation Society (EES), the Israeli Association for Programme Evaluation (IAPE), La Societe Francaise de l'Evaluation (SFE), the Malaysian Evaluation Society (MES), Programme for Strengthening the Regional Capacity for Evaluation of Rural Poverty Alleviation Projects in Latin America and the Caribbean (PREVAL), Reseau Ruandais de Suivi et Evaluation (RRSE), and the Sri Lanka Evaluation Association (SLEvA). Participants from the University of the West Indies, the Caribbean Development Bank, and the United Nations Capital Development Fund were present. Mertens and Russon (2000:277) reports how the group worked through some very difficult issues relating to trust before identifying purposes that might underlie a partnership of regional and national evaluation organisations, broad organisational principles that might guide a partnership, and an extensive list of activities that might be undertaken by a partnership.

Within Africa, there was the 2000 Johannesburg Workshop and Seminar which in itself was a follow-up of previous continental and global initiatives. There were 56 participants from 11 countries including Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. The workshop fostered networking among M&E practitioners and for sharing knowledge on M&E in the context of improved governance, accountability and effective development delivery and results. The objectives of the Workshop were five-fold to:

- Define the requirements and capabilities of M&E in the context of good governance and accountability for better results.
- Familiarise the participants with the development, requirements and uses of M&E systems.
- Present ways of designing and conducting cost-effective evaluations of issues such as human development, gender, human rights, governance and corruption, environment and infrastructure, through new approaches including participation and the sharing of local knowledge.
- Build professional teams using national M&E associations and networks.
- Develop a collaborative strategy and infrastructure for a pan-African M&E network, which could review and evaluate sound practices with a view to adopting them in Africa.

The workshop was hosted by the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) representing national governments, non-governmental organisations, universities, research institutions and the private sector, and 32 participants from multilateral and bilateral donor agencies – the World Bank, African Development Bank (AfDB), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), International Development Research Center (IDRC), Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Norway and the Netherlands. A task

force from AfDB, DBSA, the Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office of UNICEF and the World Bank organised the conference, and acted as facilitators and resource persons, together with a small number of donor representatives.

On 1–4 December 2004 the African Evaluation Association, in collaboration with the Public Service Commission of South Africa, held its Third Conference in Cape Town, South Africa, with the theme 'Africa Matters, Evaluation Matters: Joining Forces for Democracy, Governance and Development'. More than 500 delegates attended with the African continent alone having 420 delegates attending the majority being from West African countries. Both academics and practitioners of evaluation attended this conference. The timing of the conference coincided with the growing demand for accountability and universities were in the process of designing short and graduate courses in evaluation. Several other conferences and workshops were held on the continent to drum up support for evaluation and propelled the field to where it is currently. Some more important key milestones in the evolution of evaluation are needed. In June 2006 a conference of 35 M&E experts from the public, private, civil society sector and development practitioners working in Tanzania was conducted. A Steering Committee of the Tanzania Evaluation Association was nominated during the conference to spearhead the establishment of the Association in Tanzania. Committee members were drawn from public, private and civil society institutions which had work activities related to evaluation.

The International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation launched an Inaugural Assembly in Peru at the end of March 2003 as the "world umbrella" evaluation association and networks. Representatives were from 24 evaluation groupings in Latin America, Africa, Australasia, North America, Asia, Europe and the ex-Soviet Union. Support for the Assembly was received from WK Kellogg Foundation, UNICEF, the World Bank, UK Department for International Development, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, Global Green grants Fund as well as from the AEA, the Canadian Evaluation Society and other national and regional groups who sent their representatives to attend the assembly. Meanwhile, the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) was created with the support of the World Bank and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation and it had its first conference in New Delhi in April 2005. In October 2005, AEA together with the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) held a joint meeting in Toronto where some 2500 evaluation practitioners assisted in four days of the 525 concurrent sessions.

The Australasian Evaluation Society was among the earliest regional associations with a membership estimated above 700 from the region mostly from Australia and New Zealand. AES collaborated with the Malaysia Evaluation Society and the Sri Lanka Evaluation Society to scale evaluation capacity through numerous professional activities. As noted before AfrEA was created in 1999. At that time only about 18 evaluation associations or networks existed in six African countries but presently the number is more than 30 associations with a common goal of promoting evaluation on a national basis in their respective countries. In Europe, the European Evaluation Society (EES) was founded in 1994 in The Hague and started its work in 1996 with a goal to promote theory, practice and utilisation of high quality evaluation. The association brought theory closer to practice by bringing together academics and practitioners from all over Europe and from any professional sector, thus creating a forum where all participants could benefit from cooperation and bridge-building. Within Europe, national evaluation associations and networks exist in Belgium,

Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the Netherlands and the UK.

In October 2004, the Latin American and Caribbean Evaluation Network (ReLAC) was launched in Peru and included the Brazilian Evaluation Association, the Central American Evaluation Association and networks from Chili, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. ReLAC held its second biennial conference in Colombia in May 2007. Meanwhile, the International Programme Evaluation Network (IPEN) founded in 2000 mainly composed of evaluators from the former Soviet Union countries was yet another global effort that contributed to professionalising evaluation in Africa.

Since 1999, AfrEA has held major international conferences: AfrEA I (1999) and II (2002), Nairobi, Kenya, AfrEA III (2004), Cape Town, South Africa, AfrEA IV (2007), Niamey, Niger, AfrEA V (April 2009) in Cairo, Egypt and the VI Conference held in Accra, Ghana in January 2012, and finally the VII conference was recently held in March 2014 in Cameroon. Impressed by the developments in evaluation on the continent and the global developments, a new joint effort was conceived. Launched in 2010, the Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) brought together selected and recognised academic institutions or think-tanks with other organisations, such as foundations and multilateral and bilateral organisations, in a global knowledge and M&E capacity development delivery partnership.

CLEAR is a global team which aims to improve policy through strengthening M&E systems and capacities. The academic institutions and think-tanks house the Clear Centres, while the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank group hosts the programme's global hub. The Anglophone Africa centres are with the University of the Witwatersrand (WITS) located in Johannesburg, South Africa which works in partnership with the Kenya School of Government (KSG), and the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA) in Ghana. The Francophone centre is the Centre Africain d'Etudes Superieures en Gestion (CESAG) located in Dakar, Senegal and works in partnership with the International Institute for Water and Environmental Engineering (2IE), Burkino Faso. The programme is envisaged to run through 2018. In March 2012, a conference organised by the Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results for Anglophone Africa (CLEAR) in partnership with the Department of Performance M&E (DPME) in South Africa brought together government agencies from Benin, Burundi, Ghana, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda who are mandated to lead the implementation of M&E systems across their governments to varying degrees. Several other M&E workshops, seminars and conferences have taken place on the continent and more will continue to be held.

IS M&E A DISCIPLINE OF STUDY?

Evaluation professionals acknowledge that their field is a discipline although one hastens to add that this is not yet fully established like law, medicine, and psychology among others. On what basis is such a claim made? Balkin (1996:953) regards the term 'discipline' from the Latin words *discipulus*, which means pupil, and *disciplina*, which means teaching (noun). A pupil is equated to a student and using this definition, M&E in Africa is already in adulthood though has not yet reached total maturity. Several students/pupils exist in various universities studying M&E. Related to it is also the word 'disciple' as in the disciples of Jesus and the

field has various disciples scattered in academia, consultancy and the world of practice. He argues that academic disciplines are a source of authority within particular groups which think alike through training and discipline.

Krishnan (2009:9) gives six tenets or characteristics of disciplines although Eagleton (1983:47) caveats them arguing that not all disciplines must have all the characteristics. Relying on an example of English literature which lacks both a unifying theoretical paradigm and method and a definable stable object of research, it still passes as an academic discipline. For a discipline, Krishnan (2009:9) identifies the following features:

- disciplines have a particular object of research (e.g. law, society, politics), though the object of research may be shared with another discipline;
- disciplines have a body of accumulated specialist knowledge referring to their object of research, which is specific to them and not generally shared with another discipline;
- disciplines have theories and concepts that can organise the accumulated specialist knowledge effectively;
- disciplines use specific terminologies or a specific technical language adjusted to their research object;
- disciplines have developed specific research methods according to their specific research requirements; and maybe most crucially
- disciplines must have some institutional manifestation in the form of subjects taught at universities or colleges, respective academic departments and professional associations connected to it.

As a technical term Krishnan (2009:9) argues a discipline implies the organisation of learning and the systematic production of new knowledge and often disciplines are identified with taught subjects, but clearly not every subject taught at university can be called a discipline. Basheka (2013:311) while advocating for the science of public procurement maintained that science or discipline of study needs to have a high potential of classifying its subject matter into discrete variables which imply developing a core knowledge area and developing theories. M&E has articulate variables of its study and a number of models, approaches, theories and principles have been formulated. *Wikipedia*, further defines a discipline as a focused study in one academic field or profession and such discipline incorporates expertise, people, projects, communities, challenges, studies, inquiry, and research areas that are strongly associated with a given discipline. Individuals associated with such academic disciplines referred to as experts or specialists must be present. On this basis, it appears correct that the field of M&E is truly a new discipline.

Krishnan (2009:10) further informs us that a new discipline is usually founded creating a professorial chair devoted to it at an established university. On this checklist, evaluation in Africa is in its infancy as there are few or no established chairs in African universities. When M&E is evaluated based on the six tenets earlier identified, there are strong supportive reasons to claim the field's disciplinary nature. Disciplines have a particular object of research though the object of research may be shared with another discipline. Evaluation now has its object of research which broadly entails *evaluands* of different forms-policies, programmes, projects and interventions. Evaluation also now has a clear process, planning, implementation and utilisation. Moreover, it shares some objectives with other disciplines like social research. While undertaking its analysis, evaluation uses knowledge from other disciplines like social

research and the content is influenced by the *evaluand*. Evaluating the impact of a transport policy would for example benefit from the field of transport economics. Evaluation so far has some body of accumulated specialist knowledge referring to their object of research. This body of knowledge is however evolving and adopts a multidisciplinary approach.

In evaluation research, as Stockman (2011:29) wants us to believe, there are approaches and models, but strictly speaking, in his view no theories in the scientific sense of the word. This conclusion contradicts the claim that evaluation is now a scientific field for theories are sets of concepts and to scientifically claim there are no theories is to wrongly suggest that evaluation research has no variables of study (independent and dependent variables). Scriven (2004:12) also claims that "it's possible to do very good programme evaluation without getting into evaluation theory or programme theory", and declared that "the most popular misconception amongst currently politically correct programme evaluators is the evaluation of a programme (a) requires that you have, or (b) is much benefited by having, a logic model or programme theory". Meyer (2002:2) defends the use of sociological theory in evaluation research.

Donaldson and Lipsey (n.d) counsel us that reference to theory is widespread in contemporary evaluation literature, but what is meant by theory encompasses a confusing mix of concepts related to evaluators' notions about how evaluation should be practiced, explanatory frameworks for social phenomena drawn from social science, and assumptions about how programmes function, or are supposed to function. Considering the role of theory in research, good evaluations will be judged on how well they adopt a relevant theory to explain, describe, understand and predict the variables of study. These assertions will affect the desire for the discipline of evaluation to be regarded as scientific and sciences are characterised among others by their capacity to test theories. Every profession needs a unique knowledge base and for us, evaluation theory is that knowledge base (Shadish 1998:1)

As Krishnan (2009:9) suggests, disciplines use a certain language which tends to be known in most cases by people in that field. Evaluators have developed their own language centered not only on the evaluands (matters to be evaluated) but classifications of the evaluators as well as the fundamental principles that guide every evaluation. Their language also gives them the criteria followed when undertaking any evaluation. While disciplines develop specific research methods according to their specific research requirements, the evaluation discipline still utilises some methods from social research. Disciplines must have some institutional manifestation in the form of subjects taught at universities or colleges, respective academic departments and professional associations connected to them. On this benchmark evaluation has developed its subjects that are taught in universities but establishment of respective departments is yet to be embraced in all universities. There are even variations on the subjects taught at universities–the focus and locus challenges. Evaluation now has professional associations connected to it making it fulfill the discipline requirement.

Wikipedia reports that while disciplines in and of themselves are more or less focused practices, scholarly approaches such as multi-disciplinarity, inter-disciplinarity, trans-disciplinarity, and cross-disciplinarity, which integrate aspects from multiple disciplines are acceptable and help in addressing any problems that may arise from narrow concentration within specialised fields. The field of M&E enjoys a multidisciplinary approach. Scriven (2004:185) in support of this fact argues that trouble communicating across disciplines due to differences in language and/or specified concepts has made M&E evolve as "trans-

disciplinary" field. He contends that evaluation would constitute a discipline, albeit "trans", in that it meets the tenets of adhering to a discipline. This trans-disciplinary field does not mean that there is no overarching cogency to M&E.

Elkins (2006:2) clarified that M&E as a discipline must favour pragmatism, for instance by explicitly recognising resource constraints that exist in development assistance programming, and practical ramifications of the challenges. State-of-the art tools and methods in the social sciences, for instance, ideally should inform programme M&E design and implementation, but in pragmatic terms no efficient full-scale programme can responsibly allocate resources adequate to support social-science-caliber research. On his part, Golding (2009:2) suggests that because there are various important but complex problems, phenomena and concepts that resist understanding or resolution when approached from single disciplines, a multi-disciplinary approach is needed. While disciplinary depth is essential for investigating these complex issues, they also require what Howard Gardner calls a "synthesizing mind" (2006:3). They require investigators who can engage in interdisciplinary translation and synthesis, as part of multidisciplinary teams or individually, in order to develop more complete pictures than would be possible from any one disciplinary perspective. As Lyon (1992:686) shows, this is not a deviant exception, but a common path for the modern academic.

The use of an integrated scientific approach where different disciplines supply unique specialties to our understanding of the evaluation enterprise while maintaining their disciplinary focus is a proper approach for building the evaluation experts of today and the future. Boix Mansilla and Durai (2007:219) regard interdisciplinary understanding as the capacity to integrate knowledge and modes of thinking in two or more disciplines or established areas of expertise to produce a cognitive advancement – such as explaining a phenomenon, solving a problem, or creating a product – in ways that would have been impossible or unlikely through single disciplinary means. At a broad and generalised level the methodology question tends to bring up some of the old debates that still prevail in the social sciences and which relate to the old dualities in terms of how knowledge is best constructed and validated. It leads to the so-called dualities between the objective and the subjective, positivistic and interpretative approaches. Fortunately, the sharp dualities and positioning have faded away and given way to the use of pluralistic methods, more options than directives, with mixed-methods seen as acceptable (Greene and Caracelli 1997:5–18).

One of the great challenges in developing evaluation as a discipline is getting it recognised as being distinct from the various other disciplines to which it applies. Davidson (2002:3) suggests that a more difficult yet equally important task is to articulate clearly to the outside world—to clients and to other disciplines—what it is that makes evaluation unique. Golding (2009:3), reasons that we must educate for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary expertise to address complex problems in society. Interdisciplinary education must supplement disciplinary teaching and learning so students can learn how to respond to challenges that transcend disciplines, work in the confluence of multiple disciplines, and develop research trajectories that do not conform to standard disciplinary paths. Interdisciplinary subjects are pivotal for this interdisciplinary education, teaching how to understand, navigate and employ multiple and often contrary ways of knowing. In these subjects students develop a meta-knowledge about different disciplines, methods and epistemologies, and learn how to purposefully and reflectively integrate and synthesise different perspectives in order to advance understanding and solve problems. With the foregoing debate, M&E qualifies

among those subjects which claim to be disciplines of study within universities. What then is the status of this study in African universities? The next section turns to this debate.

WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE M&E DISCIPLINE IN AFRICA?

The purpose of this section is to examine the current academic programmes in the field of evaluation, their locus (location in universities) and focus (their methodological orientation). The focus will be on long-term academic courses as opposed to short-term training courses. Tarsilla (2014:6) gives lessons learned on what has worked and not worked in evaluation capacity development in Africa, with a conclusion that short-term training initiatives targeting individuals are no longer effective unless combined with other activities as part of systemic processes. Avoiding the content of evaluation training modules being more theoretical than practical favour the dominance of long-term academic programmes.

Krishnan (2009:10) reminds us of tremendous differences between the disciplines with respect to their overall standing within universities. Among the benchmarks to assess the standing of the discipline is included the number of students and the amount of research money they attract and the overall resources allocated to them by universities in terms of teaching personnel, teaching hours, and equipment. Bigger departments with more staff and more expensive equipment tend to have greater influence within universities than smaller and less equipped departments. The M&E discipline within African universities is replete with a myriad of challenges but more so the 'locus and focus' problem. This has and continues to weaken its standing in universities. While it currently attracts the majority of students, the amount of research money allocated and the overall resources allocated to run this programme are disappointingly meagre. As a result, its teaching in most universities is faced with problems like lack of adequate space, inadequate staffing as it has to rely on staff from other *disciplines*, infrastructure, and brain-drain, lack of infrastructure, poor remuneration and human resources among others. Universities lack good supervisors, faculty lack facilitation to attend evaluation conferences to nurture their theoretical knowledge.

The following Table gives an illustrative example of the nature, name and location of postgraduate evaluation courses in selected African universities.

Table: 1: Programmes in M&E at selected universities

University	Programme	School
University of Cape Town	• Master in Programme Evaluation • PhD in Programme Evaluation	Institute of M&E
Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences	• Msc M&E	School of Public Health and Social Sciences
Kenyatta University	• Master of Public Health (M&E	School of Public Health
African Nazarene University	• Master of Arts in M&E	Institute of Open and Distance learning
Mount Kenya University	• Master of Arts in M&E	School of social sciences
Daystar University	• Master of Arts in M&E	Department of development studies, school of human and social sciences

University	Programme	School
Egerton University	• Master of Education in Measurement and Evaluation	School of Education
Catholic University of Eastern Africa	• Master of Education in Educational Research and Evaluation	-
The Open University of Tanzania	• Master of Arts in M&E	Department of Economics, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Cavendish University Zambia	• Postgraduate–M&E	Education and Social Sciences
Mzumbe University Tanzania	• Master of Science in Health M&E	School of Public Administration and Management
Tanzanian Institute of Project Management	• Postgraduate Diploma in M&E	
University of Stellenbosch	• MPhil in M&E • Postgraduate Diploma in M&E • PhD in Evaluation studies	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Centre for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology
University of the Witwatersrand	• Postgraduate Diploma in Public and Development Management in the field of Public & Development Sector M&E • Master in Management of Public & Development Sector Monitoring & Evaluation (MM-M&E)	School of Public and Development Management
University of Johannesburg	• Master (MA) in Public Policy Evaluation	Department of Public Management and Governance
University of Ghana	• Master of Public Health (M&E)	School of Public Health

Source: (Compiled by the authors from a Google search)

Scrutiny of the courses shown in Table 1 suggest the locus and focus issues which raise serious methodological and operational challenges. These dilemmas raise doubts, fears and questions all of which combine to suggest that evaluation in some universities is at a crossroads. An analysis of the departments/schools/faculties where M&E courses are housed sheds light regarding the locus dilemma. In terms of locus (location) the experience reveals a 'homeless' discipline claimed by several departments in most universities. With this locus challenge, the capacity of M&E to influence the direction of debate in universities as envisioned by Krishnan becomes limited. While the number of students on monitoring programmes would result in higher revenues to institutions; the truth of the matter is that universities spend less of this portion on actual delivery of evaluation programmes.

M&E education in Africa faces the focus challenge. It is not in contention that universities play a crucial role in the supply to the market of graduates who have to steer M&E processes internally and externally. Such graduates must possess the right skills and competencies and ought to be educated in sophisticated methodologies for conducting sound evaluations in any sector. Universities must supply to the market what is demanded. The problems which have bewildered the location of the field in universities have an influence on the kind of focus the courses are oriented into. The field is new and scholars are yet to marshal the necessary theoretical infrastructure to produce the needed graduates using standalone methods. There

is thus a tendency to methodologically emphasise teaching of particular modules in graduate programmes of the field based on the department where the course is housed.

Table 2: Selected American universities teaching evaluation

University	Name of course	Location
American University	• Master in Public Policy	School of Public affairs
Antioch University	• Master of Arts in Policy Studies-Systems Thinking for Policy Analysis and Programme Evaluation	Graduate programme in policy studies
Ben Gurion University of the Negev	• Programme Evaluation and Measurement in Educational Systems • PhD IN Sociology and Politics of evaluation	Education
Boston College	• Master in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation • PhD in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation	Lynch School
Brigham Young University	• Master in Instructional Psychology and Technology w/ focus on Research and Evaluation • PhD in Instructional Psychology and Technology w/ focus on Research and Evaluation	David O McKay School of Education
Brigham Young University	• Master in Educational Inquiry, Measurement, and Evaluation	College of Education
California State University, Los Angeles	• Master in Research and Evaluation	Charter College of Education
Claremont Graduate University	• Master in Evaluation with a Co-concentration or MPH dual degree in Evaluation & Applied Research Methods	School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences
Duquesne University	• Master in programme evaluation	School of Education
Florida State University	• Master in Education policy and evaluation • PhD in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies	College of Education
Jimma University	• Master in Health M&E	College of Public Health and Medical Sciences
Michigan State University	• Master in Programme Evaluation	College of Social Science
The George Washington University	• Master in programme evaluation	The Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration
University of California, Berkeley	• Master in Quantitative Methods and Evaluation • PhD in Quantitative Methods and Evaluation	Graduate School of Education

Source: (Compiled by the authors from the American Evaluation Association website)

Table 2 gives a summary of the location of evaluation programmes in different universities within the US which was obtained through a search on the website of the American Evaluation Association. The universities offer graduate programmes or certificate programmes either directly in evaluation or with available concentrations in evaluation. In their criteria of listing, the association demands that a programme should include a sequence of at least three courses focusing directly on evaluation supported by other coursework in appropriate methodologies. In most universities, programmes in evaluation are offered in the departments/schools of public administration and management, education and public health. While many disciplines claim the field of evaluation, an example of how selected disciplines help us in understanding evaluation is necessary. In the next paragraphs an illustrative description of this concern is given. We focus on sociology, economics, public health, public policy, political science, and public administration although several other disciplines are helpful in our understanding of evaluation.

A number of known evaluation experts throughout the world have been from the discipline of Organisation, and institutions help us in understanding how planning, managing and utilisation of evaluation findings are undertaken. Many sociologists aim to conduct research that may be applied directly to social policy and welfare, while others focus primarily on refining the theoretical understanding of social processes. In evaluation of social policies and interventions, the methodologies and knowledge base of evaluation is fundamental. Not only does it provide the subject matter at micro-level of individual agency but also the macro-level of systems and the social structure. Not only does it provide a number of approaches and models but it also provides the necessary tools of analysis in understanding how the social context in which such interventions are conducted provides an important benchmark for measuring the efficiency, relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of those interventions.

Governments in both developed and developing countries design numerous economic policies to regulate the economic business of countries. The discipline of economics with its various specialisations is helpful. When evaluating economic interventions, economics focuses on the behaviour and interactions of economic agents and how economies work. Even in the main stream evaluation of other areas, economists supply useful tools and techniques of analysis like the cost-benefit analysis (CBA). Using such models, they weigh the costs of interventions against the benefits to guide whether investing in some interventions is viable or not. The economic models which often take a quantitative approach are also helpful in measuring the impact of interventions.

Evaluation takes place in all sectors and within Africa, the health sector attracts heavy funding which calls for evaluations. This explains why most public health departments and schools in medical schools have either specialised master in health M&E or concentrations in evaluation within the traditional masters of public health. Public health which refers to the science and art of preventing disease, prolonging life and promoting **health** through organised efforts and informed choices of society, organisations, **public** and private, communities and individuals adopts M&E approaches supported by the discipline of Public Health. Within the School of Public Health at Kenyatta University in Kenya for example, a master's in M&E is taught within public health and has related modules including (1) project planning, M&E (2) impact evaluation, (3) monitoring & evaluating maternal, child health and nutritional programmes, (4) M&E of malaria control and prevention programmes and (5) M&E of HIV/AIDS and TB Programmes.

In any society, governmental entities enact laws, make policies, and allocate resources. This is true at all levels. Public policy can be generally defined as a system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives. Related to this subfield is the mother discipline of public administration. Public administration is the implementation of government policy and also an academic discipline that studies this implementation and prepares civil servants for working in the public service. Related to this is the ancestor discipline of political science which deals with systems of government and the analysis of political activity and political behavior.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND THE FUTURE DIRECTION

The status in Africa suggests a positive trend as far as evaluation is concerned. Universities and other tertiary institutions continue to produce a number of graduates who find employment in the practice of evaluation whether in the public sector or the non-public sector. Across Africa, there now exists a community of evaluators and several projects to be evaluated. While the field has methodological challenges as well as utilisation challenges and has not yet developed its own theories, its multi-disciplinary approach has seen different disciplines injecting the needed theories. The field of M&E in Africa has academic programmes existing in universities, and research inquiry among both academics and practitioners is on the increase. The number of conferences and workshops devoted to discussing the body of knowledge is surely on an accelerating trend on the continent. *The African Evaluation Journal* is active and provides a window for shared knowledge on the continent. There is an impressive body of literature, a community of practitioners and even a profession with a group of "evaluators". The field has moved from infancy to adulthood from all three perspectives. From a neglected field to a fully-fledged field with its established journal, all signs are positive. The number of postgraduate courses offered in various universities across the continent and the zeal with which students have embarked on attaining qualifications in this field solidify a resolve to conclude that the area is now in adulthood.

In general terms, the future of M&E in Africa lies in the ability of the continent and its actors to harness existing internal synergies, while simultaneous exploiting opportunities provided by the global arena. Mackay (2006:13) reminds us that the experience of African countries in evaluation is relevant not only to poor countries but also to other regions. Khan (1998:326) listed the key challenges facing ECB work in Africa including: (1) sensitisation of top political leadership to the benefits of evaluation; (2) identification of the most viable institutional framework of evaluation; (3) introduction of a cost-effective method of evaluation; (4) linking evaluation to governance reform and bringing NGOs and beneficiaries into the evaluation process; and (5) introduction of innovative feedback mechanisms and establishing linkages, both nationally and internationally, to ensure maximum access to and utilisation of evaluation information. These have to be overcome if the field is to post a bright future.

In Africa, it is undoubtedly clear that a mismatch between supply and demand of evaluation professionals is still wide. Different actors at all levels need to devise concrete

steps to reduce the gap. Not only should this endeavour involve senior practitioners but academia. Interpretation of M&E evidence is an important factor that needs to guide strategic and tactical decision making to uplift the field. M&E is a sometimes maligned and frequently misunderstood field or discipline that has grown up on the fringes of international development work. Yet the M&E systems support development of a country by generating relevant, accurate, and timely information that is used to improve programme design and decision-making and thus enhance impact (Elkins 2006:1). In Africa there is now evidence of emerging country-led demands for evaluation (Porter and Goldman 2013), consistent with the general emphasis of the Paris Declaration on the use of country-owned systems. To further scale up these efforts, specific interventions are necessary:

- Ability and commitment by universities to introduce new evaluation courses which address the skills, competence issues and attitudinal elements. While most universities are likely to duplicate existing programmes, time will come when a harmonisation of curriculum is envisaged.
- The education in evaluation lies in building synergy among African universities and sharing student and staff exchanges. Increased collaborative programmes should emerge and shape the direction of the discipline. To achieve this broad goal, an association of university educators needs to be established.
- Specialised centres, and departments for M&E need to be established and should be embraced by all universities. This is intended to nurture knowledge sharing and dissemination among a community of evaluators. Doctoral programmes in the field will need to be introduced and ought to take a course-work-dissertation modality.
- The equilibrium between demand and supply of evaluation professionals should be scaled down within the next ten years. This effort should concurrently address the questions of quality and building university capacities to deliver evaluation programmes.
- The blended modes of delivery which are in synch with ICT revolution should be encouraged.
- The number of members joining professional associations should be increased and more membership benefits should be emphasised. Regional professional associations are likely to emerge to address balance and cultural concerns. Addressing the gender disparities should also be supported.
- The need to establish evaluation journals within African universities should be supported as a long-term strategy for improving communication of evaluation findings.
- The number of graduate research and publications in the field will be on the increase.

The struggle to make evaluation scientific and a discipline in its own right will continue in the years to come. The AfrEA was coined around the need to have indigenous solutions to evaluation challenges. Elkins (2006:2) is of a strong view that M&E at its best brings crucial empirical evidence to bear – directly, immediately, and within the context of the intervention – on assessments of ineffective or inefficient versus more effective or efficient programme design, implementation, performance, and achievement. At the same time, programme M&E is not merely different jargon for programme management, but a distinct undertaking: objective and representative empirical evidence generated through M&E systems is grist for interpretation by implementers in programme management systems.

NOTES

1 Prof Benon C Basheka is a Research Associate at the Centre for Public Management and Governance at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa.

2 Prof Albert K Byamugisha is a Research Associate at the Centre for Public Management and Governance at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auriacombe, C.J. 2013. In search of an analytical evaluation framework to meet the needs of governance. *Journal of Public Administration,* December 2013. 48(4.1):715–729.

Auriacombe, C.J. 2009. *Section A: Methodology Class UJ Internal Handbook for Honours Students – 2005–2009.* Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Balkin, M. 1996. Interdisciplinarity as Colonization. *Washington and Lee Law Review,* 53(3):949–970. Available at: http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol53/iss3/5. (Accessed on 27 June 2015).

BaTall, O. 2009. The role of national, regional and international evaluation organizations

in strengthening country-led monitoring and evaluation systems. In Segone, M. 2009. (Ed.). *Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems: Better evidence, better policies, better development results.* New York: UNICEF. pp.119–143.

Chanie, P. 2013. The Trajectory of Public administration in Africa. In Chanie, P. and Mihyo, P.B. (Eds.). 2013. *Thirty years of public sector reforms in Africa: Selected country experiences.* Kampala: Fountain Publishers.

Dabelstein, N. 2003. Evaluation Capacity Development: Lessons Learned. *Evaluation,* 9(3):365–369.

Davidson, J.E. 2002. Marketing Evaluation as a Profession and a Discipline. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation (JMDE:*2) ISSN 1556818. Available at: http://journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/viewFile/117/132. (Accessed on 16 May 2015).

Dennis, D.K. and Arwin, V.B. 2004. Monitoring: functional or fashionable? *Society and economy,* 26(2/3):173.

Donaldson, S.I. and Lipsey, M.W. n.d.. Roles for theory in evaluation practice. In Shaw, I., Greene, J. and Mark, M. (Eds.). n.d. *Handbook of Evaluation.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Dwivedi, O.P. (Ed.). 2011. *Public Administration in a global context: International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA) at 50.* Brussels: Bruylant.

Eagleton, T. 1983. *Literary Theory: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 197–198.

Elkins, C. 2006. Monitorian and Evaluation (M&E) for Development in Peace-Precarious Situations. Paper presented at The North-South Divide and International Studies 47th Annual ISA Convention March 22–25, 2006. Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, CA 96815 USA. Available at: http://www.rti.org/pubs/Elkins_ME_Peace.pdf. (Accessed on 14 May 2015).

Farell, K.M., Kratzmann, S., McWilliam, N., Robinson, Saunders, S., Ticknor, J., and White, K. 2002. *Evaluation Made Very easy Accessible, and Logical.* Atlantic Centre of Excellence for Women's Health. . Available at: http://www.acewh.dal.ca/eng/reports/EVAL.pdf . (Accessed on 21 June 2015).

Golding, C. 2009. *Integrating the disciplines: Successful interdisciplinary subjects. Centre for the Study of Higher Education.* The University of Melbourne, Available at: http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.a. (Accessed on 8 May 2015).

Greene, J.C. and Caracelli, V.J. 1997. Defining and describing the paradigm issue in mixed-method evaluation. In Greene, J.C. and Caracelli, V.C. (Eds.). 1997. *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Pp. 5–18.

IOCE. 2013. IOCE's master list of voluntary organisations of professional evaluators (VOPEs). Available at: http://www.ioce.net/members/national_organisations.php# (Accessed on 20 May 2015).

Kahan, B.and Goodstadt, M., 2001. The Interactive Domain Model of Best Practices in Health Promotion: Developing and Implementing a Best Practices Approach to Health Promotion. *Health Promotion Practice*, 2(1):43–67.

Khan, M.A. 1998. Evaluation Capacity Building an Overview of Current Status, Issues and Options. *Evaluation*, 4(3):310–328.

Krishnan, A. 2009. *What are Academic Disciplines? Some observations on the Disciplinarity vs. Interdisciplinarity debate*. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods, NCRM Working Article Series 03/09. Available online at: http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/783/1/what_are_academic_disciplines.pdf (Accessed on 1 September 2015).

Lyon, A. 1992. Interdisciplinarity: Giving up Territory. *College English*, 54(6):681–693.

Mackay, K. 2002. The World Bank's ECB experience. *New Directions for Evaluation*, (93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mansilla, B.V. and Duraising, E. 2007. Targeted Assessment of Students' Interdisciplinary Work: An Empirically Grounded Framework Proposal. *Journal of Higher Education,* 78(2):215–237.

Matsiliza, N. 2012. Participatory M&E: Reviewing an Inclusive Approach in the South Africa's Government Wide M&E. *Africa's public service delivery and performance review*, 1(2):67–83.

Mertens, D.M. and Russon, C. 2000. A Proposal for the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(2):275–283.

Meyer, W. 2002. *Sociological Theory and Evaluation Research: An Application and its Usability for Evaluating Sustainable Development*. Saarbrücken: Centrum für Evaluation. 2002. (CEval-Arbeitspapiere; 6). Available at: http://www.ceval.de/modx/fileadmin/user_upload/PDFs/workarticle6.pdf. (Accessed on 14 April 2015).

Mofolo, M., Mkuyana, L. and Skade, T. 2014. Actions and Behaviours Essential for Monitoring and Evaluation to Succeed in South African Public Service. *Africa's public service delivery and performance review,* 2(3):5–24.

Patton, M.Q. 2003. Inquiry into Appreciative Evaluation. *New Directions For Evaluation,* (100):85–98.

Patton, M.Q. 2008. *Utilization-focused evaluation.* 4th ed. London: SAGE.

Picciotto, R. 2012. Country-Led M&E Systems -Robert Picciotto. Part 2. Video, Youtube. Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UfNakPTODBs%3E (Viewed on 20 April 2012).

Potter, C. and Kruger, J. 2001. Community Psychology: Theory, Method and Practice. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Preskill, H. and Boyle, S. 2008. A Multidisciplinary Model of Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4):443–459.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. and Freeman, H.E. 2004. *Evaluation: A systematic Approach*. Seventh Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Russon, C. and Love, A. 1999. *Creating a world-wide community of evaluators*. Occasional Articles Series 15. Kalamazoo, MI: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.

Russon, C. and Russon, K. 2000. *The annotated bibliography of international programme evaluation*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Scriven, M. 2007. *Key Evaluation Checklist*. Evaluation Checklists Project, University of Michigan. Available at: www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists (Accessed on 31 September 2015).

Segone, M. 2008. Evidence-based Policy Making and the Role of Monitoring and Evaluation within the New Aid Environment. In Segone, M. (Ed.). 2008. *Bridging the gap*. New York: UNICEF. pp 16–45.

Stufflebeam, D.L. and Coryn, C. L. S. 2014. *Evaluation theory, models, and applications* . (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stockman, R. and Meyer, W. 2013. *Functions, Methods and Concepts in Evaluation research.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stockman, R. (Ed.). 2011. *A Practitioner handbook on evaluation.* Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Toulemonde, J. 1999. Incentives, constraints and culture-building as instruments for the development of evaluation demand. In Boyle, R. and Lemaire, D. (Eds.). 1999. *Building effective evaluation capacity.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishing. Pp.153–174.

Tarsilla, M. 2014. Evaluation capacity development in Africa: Current landscape of international partners' initiatives, lessons learned and the way forward. *African Evaluation Journal*, 2(1):13. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/aej.v2i1.89 (Accessed on 22 March 2015).

AUTHORS' CONTACT DETAILS

Professor Benon C Basheka, PhD

Professor of Public Administration and
Dean, School of Business and Management
Uganda Technology and Management University (UTAMU)
UTAMU Resource Centre, Plot 6 & 8 Erisa Road in Bugolobi.
Tel: +256(0)782459354/+256(0)752459354
Email: bbasheka@utamu.ac.ug /bbasheka@yahoo.co.uk
Website: www.utamu.ac.ug

Professor Albert K Byamugisha, PhD

Adjunct Associate Professor (UTAMU) and Commissioner, Monitoring & Evaluation
Office of the Prime Minister, 4th Floor Apollo Kagwa Road- New Building
Tel: +256-772 401732/ +256 704092625
P O Box 341
Kampala
Uganda
e-mail: abyamugisha@gmail.com