

## **Influence Of Monitoring and Evaluation on Sustainability of Hiv/Aids Programmes among Community Based Organizations in Kericho County, Kenya**

William Kimaru Sugut<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Charles M Rambo<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Joyce A Osogo<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management Student, University of Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>2</sup>(School of Continuing and Distance Education) University of Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>3</sup>(School of Continuing and Distance Education) University of Nairobi, Kenya

Correspondence to: William, K. Sugut,

---

**ABSTRACT:** Community based organizations encounter many challenges related to monitoring and evaluation. This study focused on monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of community based organizations. Therefore, the main objective of the study was to examine influence of monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of HIV/AIDS programmes among community based organizations in Kericho County, Kenya. The study used McKinsey 7s model and cross-sectional survey research design. The target population was 43 community based organizations with a total 859 employees. A sample size of 178 participants drawn from 30 selected CBOs were included to take part in the study. Data was collected and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics with support from statistical package for social sciences version 21. The findings indicated that monitoring and evaluation influenced sustainability of HIV/AIDS programmes in community based organizations. The study recommends that organizations should adopt policies that support beneficiaries' involvement in monitoring and evaluation in order to promote sustainability of their projects.

**Key words:** HIV/AIDS Programme, Community based organization, Monitoring and Evaluation  
Date of Submission: 10.11.2017

-----  
Date of Submission: 12-10-2017

Date of acceptance: 27-10-2017  
-----

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) presents one of the greatest challenge in sustainability of community based organizations (Oino, Gutwa & Geoffrey, 2015). Monitoring and evaluation is key in promoting sustainability of the community based organizations as it provides the means of collecting and integrating important information into the policy cycle, thus providing the basis for sound governance and accountability (Painter et al.,2010). However majority of the community based organizations (CBOs) face challenges in sustaining their projects due to many factors including lack of M & E skills, poor stakeholder participation, lack of commitment by staff members, inadequate resources, and usually monitoring is seen as an responsibility imposed by the management (Mapfumo, 2015). Ndegwa (2015), proposed that long-term sustainability of CBO projects is dependent on many factors that include; adequate funding, effective M & E system, and trained and committed project team (Ndegwa, 2015). In Kericho County, only 20% of the CBOs providing HIV/AIDS services are active and implementing their activities as per their mandate (CACC Report, 2016).

### **II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Mainstreaming monitoring and evaluation is still a major challenge in many organizations including community based organizations. The elusiveness of the practices is illustrated by lack of sustainability of organizations that are started to support communities and offer humanitarian services. Failure to mainstream better monitoring and evaluation practices has a causal linkage with the failure to transition from CBO's survival phase up to sustainability. In Kenya, only 25% of the initiated CBOs survive beyond two years of their establishment (Nyamu, 2015), while in Kericho County, sustainability of CBOs engaged in HIV/AIDS projects stands at 20% (CACC report 2016). This study, therefore, sought to answer the question, how does monitoring and evaluation influence sustainability of HIV/AIDS programmes among Community based organizations in Kericho County, Kenya?

### **III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

This study intended to examine how monitoring and evaluation influence sustainability of HIV/AIDS programme among community based organizations in Kericho County, Kenya

### **IV. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Monitoring is the process of collecting and analyzing programme or project related activities data in order to measure the efficiency of interventions against set targets and taking appropriate actions to ensure the project is on track while evaluation refers to the process of assessing the effectiveness of interventions undertaken in a project or programme over medium and long-term (Mapfumo, 2015). As a result, monitoring and evaluation generate regular response on project achievements and likely problems at an early stage and propose possible resolution, examine the effectiveness with which the various parts of the project are being implemented and suggest improvements, assess the extent to which the project is able to realize its general objectives and provides course of action for the development of future projects (Karani, Bichanga, & Kamau, 2014). Therefore, M&E facilitates managers to uphold transparency, responsibility, accountability and to empower all stakeholders in the organization (Gopichandran and Krishna, 2013). In addition, M&E serve both as a corrective function during project implementation process, allowing well-timed adjustment where needed and as a guide to structuring future planning of activities more efficiently and effectively (Douvere and Ehler 2011).

Good quality data obtained from M&E is determined in terms of accuracy, reliability, preciseness, completeness, timeliness of information to the organization which help in decision-making (Mayanmar, 2016). A study by (Mapfumo, 2015) indicated that 100% of the organizations use standard reporting tools to collect information on their activities and generate regular reports according to funder requirements (Mapfumo, 2015). This study also showed that 83.3% of the organizations utilize the M&E findings to make internal programme management decisions and 57.1% provide regular feedback on M&E findings to all stakeholders (Mapfumo, 2015). Findings from M&E are usually presented to the relevant stakeholders through regular staff meetings, during review of work plans, site visits, internal newsletters, during planned learning and sharing events and publications in order to gain support of the stakeholders in running the organization effectively (Mayanmar, 2016).

In addition, the study by Mapfumo, further revealed that 85.7% of the organizations have data quality control measures in place, 42.9% conduct data quality audit and data verification of their programme on a regular basis while 57.1% have trained their programme staff on how to use data collection and information reporting tools (Mapfumo, 2015). This study also showed that 71.4% of the organizations share M&E findings with the funders, programme staff and beneficiaries where 14.3% of them use newsletters to disseminate the M&E findings to the stakeholders and a further 14.3% of the organizations display M&E findings on their notice board (Mapfumo, 2015). Additionally the study documented that only 71.4% of the organizations use M&E findings to make programme management decisions and 33.3% of the organizations evaluate their programs at least quarterly, 16.7% bi-annually while 16.7% do not evaluate their programs at all (Mapfumo, 2015).

Similarly, a study conducted by Chesinya and Wanyoike (2016) on 'Determinants of effective implementation of constituency development fund projects in Baringo central constituency' revealed that M&E remains to be a major challenge to implementation and sustainability of community projects (Chesinya & Wanyoike, 2016). The study found out that results from M&E are not disclosed to all stakeholders in the organization therefore breeding suspicion among the stakeholders on use of resources by the management (Chesinya & Wanyoike, 2016). Other studies showed that most organizations do not carry out M&E for their projects adequately due to lack of commitment by management, lack of competence in using M&E tools, strict donor requirements and lack of adequate personnel (Karani *et al.*, 2014). Similarly, the study by Mapfumo, (2015) noted a number of challenges that hinder implementation of M&E among the NGOs, including lack of statistical skills among the staff, deficiency of experienced staff, inadequate resources, poor stakeholder participation, lack of M&E skills, lack of commitment by staff members, and lack of right M&E tools (Mapfumo, 2015).

Additionally a study by Karanja (2014), showed that majority of organizations do not regularly carry out evaluation of their projects as required, for instance 23% of the projects were not evaluated at all. Similarly, Githika (2013) in his study revealed that most organizations lack capacity to conduct M&E for their projects and few of them (27%) document their M&E process and use data for decision making, donor reporting and to provide feedback to the community (Githika, 2013). The study further noted that majority users of the M&E report are the donors and the government while only 11% of the NGOs use the report to make managerial decisions (Githika, 2013).

## V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used cross-sectional survey design. Cross sectional survey design was adopted for several reasons. It allows information to be collected from a population that is geographically dispersed, the design is cost effective, it involves one contact with the study population and is easy to conduct (Bhattacharjee, 2012). The study target population was all CBOs involved in HIV/AIDS programme in Kericho County. A total of 859 employees from the 43 CBOs formed the target population for the study. Yamane’s (1967) formula was used to obtain a sample of 30 CBOs out of the 43 to participate in the study. The same formula was used to arrive at a sample 178 respondents from the target of 859 employees. The study adopted a semi-structured questionnaire to collect primary data and also used a structured interview schedule to obtain data from the key informants. The interview schedule was selected because of its ability to collect in-depth information from the respondents thus enriching the quality of the data collected (Kumar, 2011). To ensure validity of the research instruments, the study employed content validity where the researcher sought opinions from experts, scholars and the supervisors concerning the structure and contents of the instruments. To ensure reliability of the instruments, the researcher employed “test-retest” methods of measurement. Test-retest reliability was estimated by administering the questionnaire to 20 respondents at an interval of two weeks apart during pilot survey. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques to analyse the responses obtained from CBO members’ questionnaires and key informants interview schedule for the objectives of the study. Data analysis approach that was adopted by the study include descriptive statistics of mean, standard deviation and inferential statistics of regression with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21.

## VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents results arising from the analysis of data collected using questionnaires.

### 6.1 Data Quality Assurance on Sustainability of Projects

The study first sought to establish the influence of data quality assurance on sustainability of projects. The summary of the responses are shown in Table 1.

*Table 1: Data Quality Assurance on Sustainability of Projects*

Statements	S D F(%)	D F(%)	N F(%)	A F(%)	S A F(%)	Mean	Standard deviation
The organization conducts regular data quality audits on their reports	1(0.8)	4(3.2)	3(2.4)	100(79.4)	18(14.3)	4.03	0.606
The organization provides feedback to all staff on the quality of their reporting	0	4(2.2)	3(2.4)	85(67.5)	34(27)	4.18	0.625
The organization has standard reporting tools	0	28(22.2)	30(23.8)	38(30.2)	30(23.8)	3.56	1.085
Average						3.92	0.772

The aggregate score in Table 1 showing the mean = 3.92 and S.Dev = 0.772 indicates that more than half (50%) of the respondents were in agreement that data quality assurance influenced sustainability of projects and that there was low variations in opinion regarding this construct. This is supported by the finding that majority 118(93.7%) with a mean of 4.03 agreed that their organizations conducted data quality audits on their M&E reports. Majority (94.5%) mean = 4.18 of the respondents also agreed that feedback was provided by their organizations to all staff on the quality of their reporting. Additionally, it is evident from the findings that the CBOs had standard reporting tools as indicated by majority (54%) mean = 3.56 who agreed with the statement. These findings were in agreement with Myanmar (2016) who stressed the need for high quality M&E data in management decision making. Good quality data obtained from M&E is determined in terms of accuracy, reliability, preciseness, completeness, timeliness of information to the organization which help in decision-making (Myanmar, 2016). However, the findings failed to agree with Mapfumo (2015) that 57.1% provide regular feedback on M&E findings to all stakeholders, 42.9% conduct data quality audit and data verification of their programme on a regular basis and 100% of the organizations use standard reporting tools to collect information on their activities and generate regular reports according to funder requirements.

### 6.2 Reporting Mechanism on Sustainability of Projects

The study also sought to establish whether organization’s reporting mechanism influence sustainability of projects. The summary of the responses are shown on Table 2

**Table 2: Reporting Mechanism on Sustainability of Project**

Statements	S D F(%)	D F(%)	N F(%)	A F(%)	S A F(%)	Mean	Standard deviation
There is a schedule for data management in place that meets program management needs	5(4.0)	4(3.2)	23(18.3)	53(42.1)	41(32.5)	3.96	0.999
Stakeholders receive reports within the agreed time	1(0.8)	2(1.6)	4(3.2)	81(64.3)	38(30.2)	4.24	0.588
Reports are used to make decisions	0	0	3(2.4)	80(63.5)	43(34.1)	4.32	0.516
Average						4.173	0.701

Looking at the findings in Table 2 it is evident that the CBOs reporting mechanism influenced the sustainability of their projects as suggested by a mean of 4.173 and standard deviation of 0.701. This implies that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements describing the use of reporting mechanisms in their organizations with little variations in their opinions. Particularly, most (74.6%) of the respondents with a mean of 3.96 agreed that their CBO had a schedule for data management comprising of collection, collation, analysis and reporting in place that met program management needs. The findings also suggest that the stakeholders received reports within the stipulated time as indicated by majority (94.5%) of the respondents with a mean was  $4.24 \pm 0.558$ . The reports were used to make decisions for the CBOs projects as indicated by majority (97.6%) of the respondents who agreed with the statement with a mean was  $4.32 \pm 0.516$  indicating low variability in their opinions. These agree with Mapfumo (2015) who observed that most of the organizations share M&E findings with the funders, programme staff and beneficiaries who use the M&E findings to make programme management decisions. The findings, however, disagree with those of Chesinya and Wanyoike (2016) who found that results from M&E are not disclosed to all stakeholders in the organization therefore breeding suspicion among the stakeholders on use of resources by the management. The finding also disagree with Githika (2013) who study revealed that only few organizations document their M&E process and use data for decision making, donor reporting and to provide feedback to the community.

### 6.3 Potential users of M&E Reports on Sustainability of Projects

The study finally sought to establish whether users of M&E influence sustainability of projects. Summary of the responses is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Potential users of M&E reports on Sustainability of Projects**

Statements	Frequency	Percentage %
Government	126	100
Donor/Funders	100	79.4
Management	79	62.7
Program team	53	41.3
Beneficiaries	15	11.9

It is evident from the findings in Table 3 that the government was the potential user of their M&E reports as indicated by all respondents. Other major consumers of the M&E reports were donors (79.4%), the management of the CBOs (62.7%) and program team (41.3%) indicated it was the program team. However, it appears that the beneficiaries were not mainly regarded as potential users of the M&E reports as only (11.9%) of the respondents indicated their reports ended up being disseminated to the beneficiaries. These findings concur with Githika (2013) who established that the major consumers of the M&E reports were the government and donors while only 11% of the NGOs use the report to make managerial decisions. Karani et al., (2014) explained that monitoring and evaluation reports provide reliable information to the various stakeholders including donors, government, program management and beneficiaries on the status of the project, achievements, utilization of funding and any challenges experienced in the project.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concludes that majority of the community based organizations carried out data quality audits on their reports and that majority of the organizations provided feedback to all staff regarding the quality of their reporting and stakeholders received reports on time in order to make decisions. However, a significant number of the organizations did not have standard tools for reporting. This could have a negative effect on monitoring of their activities since all the indicators might not be captured adequately. The study further concludes that majority of community based organizations had a specified schedule for data collection, processing and reporting in place. Like in previous studies, it was also established that the potential users of monitoring and evaluation reports were the government and the project donors while project team members and the beneficiaries ranked the least in terms of monitoring and evaluation reports usage. This could be because the government requires each organization to report on its activities that they provide to the community members. The study recommends that organizations should adopt policies that give equal chances to usage of monitoring and evaluation reports to all stakeholders including the project team members and the beneficiaries.

## VIII. STUDY LIMITATIONS

The study design was cross-sectional survey research where data was collected at a point in time and therefore may not establish a causal relationship among the variables. This study focused on CBOs implementing HIV/AIDS activities and therefore the findings from the study may not be generalized to CBOs implementing other activities.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices* (Second edi). Florida: Collections Textbook.
- [2] Chesinya, P. K., & Wanyoike, D. (2016). Determinants of effective implementation of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Baringo Central Constituency , kenya, 4(4), 31–42.
- [3] Douvere, F., Ehler, C. N., Journal, S., Spatial, M., June, P., Douvere, F., & Ehler, C. N. (2011). The importance of monitoring and evaluation in adaptive maritime spatial planning Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article : The importance of monitoring and evaluation in adaptive maritime spatial planning. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 15(2), 305–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s>
- [4] Githika, M. S. (2013). Influence of Project Management Practices on Implementation of HIV and AIDs projects: A Case of Civil Society Organizations in Imenti North Sibcounty, Meru County Kenya. *Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 2(3), 45–50.
- [5] Gopichandran, V., Kumar, A., Krishna, I., Gopichandran, V., Kumar, A., & Krishna, I. (2013). and evaluation in public health Monitoring and evaluating : an ethical framework for monitoring and evaluation in public health. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 39(1), 31–35.
- [6] Karani, F. N., Bichanga, W. O., & Kamau, C. G. (2014). Effective use of monitoring and evaluation systems in managing HIV / AIDS related projects : A case study of local NGOS in Kenya. *Science Journal of Business and Management*, 2(2), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.sjbm.20140202.13>
- [7] Karanja, G. M. (2014). Influence of management practices on sustainability of youth income generating projects in Kangema District , Murang ' a County , Kenya Doctoral Candidate , University of Nairobi , School of Continuing and Distance Education , Department of Extra-mural st. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(2), 1–12.
- [8] Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology*. (M. Sources, Ed.) (Third Edit). New Delhi: C & M Digitals.
- [9] Mapfumo, T. (2015). *Monitoring and Evaluation of HIV/AIDS programmes by Non-Governmental Organisations: DURBAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY*.
- [10] Myanmar, Y. (2016). *Developing Project Monitoring and Evaluation for Learning And Accountability ( MEAL ) PLANS Guidelines for Implementing Partners*.
- [11] Mugenda, M. and. (1999). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approach*. Nairobi: Acts Press. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1101135>
- [12] Ndegwa Anne, K. (2015). *Factors Influencing the Sustainability of KEMRI Hiv / Aids Grants Funded Projects in Kenya*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11732/669>
- [13] Nyamu, D. M. (2015). Factors Influencing Sustainability Of Community Service Order Projects In Kitui County, Kenya. *Unpublished*, 1(1), 29–34.
- [14] Oino, P. G., & Geoffrey, T. K. (2015). The Dilemma in Sustainability of Community- Based Projects in Kenya. *Global Journal of Advanced Research*, 2(4), 757–768.
- [15] Painter, T. M., Ngalame, P. M., Lucas, B., Lauby, J. L., & Herbst, J. H. (2010). Strategies Used by Community-Based Organizations to Evaluate Their Locally Developed HIV Prevention Interventions : Lessons Learned from the CDC ' s Innovative Interventions Project, 22(5), 387–401.

William Kimaru Sugut. "Influence Of Monitoring and Evaluation on Sustainability of Hiv/Aids Programmes among Community Based Organizations in Kericho County, Kenya." *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* , vol. 22, no. 10, 2017, pp. 26–30.