

The Effect of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework on Development Project in Education Bureau in Somali Regional State in Case of Jig-jiga Branch.

REGAN DEBEBE BELUHU

Department of Management, Jig-Jiga University, ETHIOPIA.
College of Business and Economics, Jig-Jiga University, ETHIOPIA.
Email: reganadil@gmail.com

Abstract: Monitoring and evaluation during implementation leads to projects success. This study sought to determine how the effect of monitoring and evaluation framework implemented by bureau of education in region are monitored and evaluated as laid down by the current monitoring and evaluation framework found in the education bureau in Somali regional state for designing and building the structure of monitoring and evaluation systems. The purpose of this study was to find out the effect of monitoring and evaluation framework to the success of development educational project in Jig-Jiga district. The findings of this study should assist the development educational project framework implementing to recognize the role played by participatory monitoring and evaluation practices in the success and sustainability of the projects. The study targeted residents of Jig-Jiga area who have benefited from donor funded educational project. The study utilized a case study design because it was considered a healthy research method particularly when a holistic and in-depth investigation is required. A sample of 47 respondents was selected from education bureau M&E officers, M&E process owner, finance & logistics process owner, case coordinators, senior officers and officers from Jig-Jiga area through purposive sampling. Data was collected through a questionnaire with seven questions where respondents indicated responses on statements in a Likert scale. Data from semi structured interviews from key informants, focused discussion groups and the government officers who had been involved in these projects were used for triangulation. Quantitative data collected was analyzed. The study established that the community was not involved in any monitoring and evaluation of the educational projects. Participatory monitoring and evaluation in development of educational projects therefore contributes to the success of educational projects though it should be complemented with good project management skills. For M & E framework to be applied to the projects, the projects implementing should conduct trainings to the community to build up their capacity in understanding and participation in the monitoring and evaluation framework system.

Key Words; Monitoring and Evaluation, the Existence structure of Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Introduction

Most educational development projects want to contribute to an educational change in an educational system, such as increasing student learning by providing textbooks, spreading educational opportunities by providing distance education, or raising the quality of teaching by providing in-service training to teachers. The audiences of educational projects often want to know how far the project is in accomplishing the planned change. Monitoring and evaluation

activities can help project management with keeping the audience informed about the progress of their project.

The goals of many social development projects and programs involve such things as the development of indigenous sustainable capacity, the promotion of participation, the awakening of consciousness, and the encouragement of self-reliant strategies. To achieve these goals the role of monitoring and evaluation activities are very important (Edmunds and merchants, 2008). Monitoring and evaluation allows people

to learn from past experiences, improve service delivery, plan and allocate resources and demonstrate results as part of accountability to stakeholders (Hilhorst, and Guijt, 2006). Depending on the context, stakeholders can include everyone from end-users to government agencies. M&E program performance achieves this because it enables the improved management of the outputs and outcomes while encouraging the allocation of resources where it will have the greatest impact. M&E also assists in keeping projects on track, providing a basis for reassessing priorities and creating an evidence base for current and future projects (Henry, 2006).

Monitoring and Evaluation is a powerful project management tool that can be used to improve the way governments and organizations achieve results. Governments need financial, human resource, accountability systems and good performance feedback system. M&E takes decision makers one step further in assessing whether and how goals are being achieved over time. These systems help to respond to stakeholders growing demand for results (Kusek and Rist, 2004).

Milosevic et al., (2003) alludes that few organizations have integrated M&E programmes, and many invest time and resources in collecting data that are never used. Monitoring of single variables or tracking of implementation through mechanisms such as manual reports, financial accounting and project reviews, are important but cannot alone show whether the organization objectives are being met.

Effective monitoring and evaluation of projects is usually one of the ingredients of good project performance. It provides means of accountability, demonstrating transparency to the stakeholders and facilitates organizational learning through documenting lessons learned in the implementation of the project and incorporating the same in the subsequent project planning and implementation or through sharing experiences with other implementers (Crawford

and Bryce, 2003). Monitoring keeps track of the implementation schedule by focusing on the efficiency of resource use towards generating desired outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is the systematic collection and analysis of information as a project progresses while evaluation effectiveness of outputs in delivering the planned purposes and goals. It is the comparison of actual project impacts against the agreed strategy plans. It can be formative which taking place during the life of a project or organization, with way of functioning. It can also be summative which drawing learning from a completed project or an organization that is no longer functioning.

Thus, it is difficult to conceptualize monitoring in the absence of evaluation (Ademala and Lanvin, 2005).

In today's highly viable dealing environment, budget oriented planning and forecast-based planning methods are insufficient for a large organization to survive and prosper. The firm must engage in considered planning that clearly defines objectives and assess both the internal and external situation to formulate plan, implement, evaluate the progress, and make necessary adjustment necessary to stay in track (Thompson and Strickland, 2003). While any project that is not properly monitored and evaluated, it will definitely result into project failure. The factors that can cause project failure in the public sector to include budget indiscipline, and non-involvement of stakeholders in formulating certain projects are other factors responsible for project failures (Kusek and Rist, 2004; Lawal, 2010). Moreover, according to Uitto, (2004) and Reijer et al., (2002) in order to done inconsistency on capture and document lessons learned on the project implementation, the project stakeholders do not optimally learn from the previous projects they implemented and this might have resulted in repeating the same mistakes.

Although developed countries attempting to institute a whole of government approach

toward M&E undertake project plan to guide their development of project priorities, Developing countries can find it difficult to establishing M&E systems (Kusek and Rist, 2001). This difficulty may stem from no means to link results achieved to a public expenditure framework, and lack of political will, a weak central agency or a lack of capacity in planning & analysis, and loosely interconnected with a lack of strong administrative cultures and indiscipline of transparent financial systems. Accordingly, Organizations are becoming progressively more dependent on service providers to deliver performance at a viable level according to stakeholders. However, to be able to achieve this, the service delivery process needs to be achieving desired outcomes, systematically reporting on the progress towards outcomes and agreed upon considering involved stakeholders' needs and wants. Moreover, effect of an M&E framework process needs to be defined on how to clearly identify of existence of structure M&E, obtainable plan of project, implement of M&E and thereafter execute the effect of result on M&E. One needs to assure that there is no force that can influence the process in such a way that it threatens to become critical and/or a stopper (Grundy, 2008). Effective an M&E enables managers and other stakeholders with regular feedback on project implementation and early indication of progress and problems in the achievement of planned results in order to facilitate timely adjustments of strategies in the operation of projects.

Previous several studies have been done on effective of M&E. according to Ogweno (2010) studied effective M&E comparison between donor funded and non-donor funded projects found out that in donor funded projects managing research projects for impact implies that M&E must be linked to overall project operations with outputs, outcomes, and impact normally summarized in the project. With regard to non-donor funded projects he found out that for M&E to be successful it is important

to evidently organize existence of structure M&E, prior to starting developing a M&E, each stakeholder's stakes as well as the roles resulting from them. Githiomi (2010) studied the M&E the findings were that an effective M&E is more than a statistical task or an external obligation. Thus, it must be planned, managed, and provided with adequate resources. Kimaiyo (2011) researched on the effective of M&E of constituency development project funds and established that community participation, review of projects every year and use of financial system were used for monitoring and evaluation.

The education development sector plays a key role in the country's socio economic development. In fact all other sectors depend on this sector for them to function. The regulation of the development of project funded in the education sector has changed the way the educational infrastructural capacities improvement in the region operate as the organization no longer determine the funded development of project they charge for the way used on their own practice. To survive, Government & NGOs funded projects organization must be responsive enough to respond to the pressures to struggle on levels to better than any other in the past. Focus has now shifted to internal processes in order to offer the organization the best opportunity to take up the unique challenges facing the organization today. In order for BoE to know if it is viable in rising struggle with a lot of struggle, effect M&E is important. An effective M&E framework will enable BoE to know whether all the plan of project it has put in place will enable the organization to participate effectively stakeholders. Effect of M&E framework implementation will also enable BoE to identify any ambiguity in its implementation and correct any deviations from the planned project which if not corrected might render the entire set of planning ineffective.

Accordingly, this study is conducted in the Somali regional state in education bureau which is located in the eastern part of Ethiopia. Nowadays, there are Government & NGOs funded projects in the region. The educational infrastructural facilities were carried out by these two projects. The NGOs funded projects in the educational sector best examples are UNICEF, UNHCR SCUK, Islamic Relief and Mercy Corps. The objectives of these NGOs are to contribute very important things for the educational improvement in the region. The Government funds were used for the construction of different projects just like NGOs. Besides, the bridges project (piloting the delivery of quality education services in the developing regional states of Ethiopia) is a one-year department for international development funded project aimed at understanding how additional department for international development funded project funding for primary and secondary education can catalyze and complement existing government efforts in the developing regional states and contribute to peace building.

However, the researcher tried to see other studies too and come up with insight in M&E of development project. The research here is that the effectiveness of M&E of development project is an expanded concept to overcome because all researchers focused with result based management in the level of M&E with indicators of it like existence of structure M&E. So that, the researcher is aspired to fill gap to know its manifesting and fill the empirical gap in the Somali regional state bureau education and Hence, in the previous study no assessment done about the effect of M&E framework of development educational projects in Somali regional state bureau education. Therefore, the purpose of this study is focus on assessing the effect of M&E framework of development of educational projects run by the Somali regional state bureau education in case of Jig-Jiga district. As the main objective of this research

is to investigate effect of monitoring and evaluation framework of development of educational project in Somali regional state bureau of education in case of Jig-Jiga main branch. This was done with a specific objective of sharing the results or specific objectives were raised assess the existence of structure monitoring and evaluation on development of educational project. It is hoped that the recommendations can be applied to future development of educational project to ensure projects success.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Existence of Structure of Monitoring and Evaluation

Existence structure of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is a powerful public management tool that can be used to help policymakers and decision makers track progress and demonstrate the impact of a given project, program, or policy and in that it moves beyond an emphasis on inputs and outputs to a greater focus on outcomes and impacts (Kusek and Rist, 2004). They asserted that the basic dimensions/perspectives of the most common the existence the structure of M&E of development projects are conducting a readiness assessment, agree on outcome, selection of key performance indicators to monitor outcomes, baseline form, selecting results targets criteria, reporting and using finding as well as sustaining M&E system within the organization.

2.1.1 Conducting Readiness Assessment

Conducting readiness assessment structure of M&E system which determining the capacity and willingness of the government monitor and evaluate of the development goals to construct a results-based M&E system (Kusek and Rist, 2004). This assessment addresses such issues as a clear mandate exist for M&E, the presence of strong leadership at the most senior levels of the government, desire to see resource and policy decisions linked to the budget, involved civil society as a partner with government. Further

they asserted that the government powerful of actors has been chief at determining the formulation of results-based M&E system (kusek and Rist, 2001). Higher readiness assessment scores indicate higher level of readiness that enhances the likelihood of achieving success in the project. Such an assessment not only identifies an organization's current capability to implement a project, but also identifies weakness areas that must be improved to achieve a better state of readiness for implementation (Razmi, Sangari, & Ghodsi, 2009). Therefore, the results of this readiness assessment suggest that the government is prepared to take ownership of the effort and to systematically and slowly begin to introduce the concepts of results management. Visible capacity exists that can be drawn upon to sustain the effort. Significantly, there is obvious political support to provide the necessary leadership (kusek and Rist, 2004).

2.1.2 Agreeing on Outcome

Agreeing on outcomes to monitor and evaluate addresses the key requirement of developing strategic outcomes that then focus and drive the resource allocation and activities of the government and its development partners (kusek and Rist, 2004). These outcomes should be derived from the strategic priorities (goals) of the country. According to McCoy et al., (2005) argue that outcomes of project as the broad changes in development conditions. Outcomes help us answer the "so what?" question. Outcomes often reflect behavior or economic change and impact as the overall and long-term effects of an intervention/project. Impacts are the ultimate result attributable to a project intervention over an extended period. Outcome provides a structure for logical thinking in project design, implementation and M&E. It makes the project logic explicit, provides the means for a thorough analysis of the needs of project beneficiaries and links project objectives, strategies, inputs, and activities outputs and outcomes to the specified needs

(NORAD, 1995). Therefore, outcome evaluation is concerned with outputs and focuses more on the readily available and tangible results of a project

2.1.3 Selection of Performance Indicator to Monitoring Outcome

Indicators are defined as the variables used to measure progress towards goals indicators of project performance and outcome depend on the objectives pursued and the strategies adopted which vary from program to program (Stem et al. 2005). It is recommended that the desist from the use or reliance on pre-designed indicators which are often context-insensitive (USAID, 2000). Quantitative indicators describe information such as attendances, people served, is best captured by standardized form then information is aggregated at regular intervals. Materials distributed can be captured by a standard distribution log. The standardization facilitates the implementation staff and allows for comparability across implementation areas and also facilitates data entry of the information. these actual output sat specified periods such as monthly are then compared with planned or targeted outputs as illustrated in the project plan (Gyorkos, 2003). Qualitative indicators describe situations and give an in-depth understanding of issues of the outputs. Methods such as focus groups discussions, observation, interviews are used with qualitative methods of monitoring. For evaluation of both the outcomes and goals, both qualitative and quantitative methods are recommended in order to get clear in-depth understanding in to the success of the project (Hughes-d'Aeth, 2002; FHI, 2004; Rakotonahary et al., 2002). Therefore, Indicators can help identify trends, predict problems, assess options, set performance targets, and evaluate a particular jurisdiction or organization. The performance indicators necessary to guide the monitoring team tell how far clients' performance has gone in achieving the objectives of each project activity (Madhakani, 2012). On the other hand, one of

the best practices that have been adopted because of its structured approach is the use of the Logical framework approach as a tool to aid both the planning and the M&E functions during implementation (Aune, 2000; FHI, 2004). The result of the logical framework approach is that shows the relationship of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and goals of the project and M&E the project using the logical framework entails using “input indicators” such as a budget to monitor resource use throughout the implementation of the project (Kusek and Rist, 2004).

2.1.4 Baseline Study

A baseline study should be undertaken before the project plan commences so that the condition prior to the implementation of the project is determined. This aids the evaluation function in order to determine whether the designed project did have an impact (Webb and Elliot, 2002; and Gyorkos, 2003). The baseline is the first measurement of an indicator and provides the evidence by which decision-makers are able to measure subsequent project performance (Kusek, et al., 2001). Without baseline data, it is very difficult to measure change over time or to monitor and evaluate. With baseline data, progress can be measured against the situation that prevailed before an intervention (Shapiro, 2004). Since the reliability, validity and relevance of any monitoring system is strongly based upon the availability of valid and relevant baseline data, it is recommended that up-to-date statistical and other data be acquired prior to program inception (Amjad, 2009). Information and data should be valid, verifiable and transparent. The practice of using inappropriate baselines defeats the whole concept of “data quality triangle”, which encompasses elements of data reliability, data validity and data timeliness (Kusek, et al., 2004).

Hughes-d’Aeth (2002) argues that a baseline study helps assess the state of the community in

terms of what the project intends to achieve. This is important for evaluating the project for it provides a point of reference to determine how far the community moved in terms of the achieving the project objectives. According to Shapiro, (2004) With reference to a development of project, a baseline may determine the levels of effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation knowledge in the community before the project, to be compared with levels of knowledge at the end of the project to determine how successful the project was on that aspect.

2.1.5 Selecting Results Targets

Once the indicators are identified, the stakeholders should establish baselines and targets for the level of change they would like to see. The baseline and target should be clearly aligned with the indicator, using the same unit of measurement. Once the baseline is established, a target should be set. The target will normally depend on the programmed period and the duration of the interventions and activities (Hulme, 2000; Kusek and Rist, 2004). A target is a specified objective that indicates the number, timing and location of that which is to be realized. In essence, targets are the quantifiable levels of the indicators that a country, society, or organization wants to achieve by a given time (USAID, 2000). Targets are based on known resources (financial and organizational) plus a reasonable projection of the available resource base over a fixed period of time (IFAD, 2002). Setting results targets recognizes that most outcomes are long term, complex, and not quickly achieved. Thus there is a need to establish interim targets that specify how much progress towards an outcome is to be achieved, in what time frame, and with what level of resource allocation. Measuring results against these targets can involve both direct and proxy indicators as well as the use of both quantitative and qualitative data (Dorotinsky, 2003).

2.1.6 Reporting

Reporting Findings is crucial step, as it determines what findings are reported to whom, in what format, and at what intervals. This address the existing capacity for producing such information as it focuses on the methodological dimensions of accumulating, assessing, and preparing analyses and reports (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Reporting is closely related to M&E work, since data are needed to support the major findings and conclusions presented in a project report (IFAD 2002). Performance reports should include explanations (if possible) about poor outcomes and identify steps taken or planned to correct problems (Hatry, 1999).

2.1.7 Using Finding

Using findings to improve performance and purpose of building a results-based M&E system. Findings are not simply in generating results based information but in getting that information to the appropriate users in the system in a timely fashion so that they can take the information into account in the management of the project (Rist, 2000). However, its addresses that roles of the development partners and civil society in using the information, to strengthen and respond to the public's demands for accountability& transparency, and help to formulate and justify budget requests and make operational resource allocation procedures& decisions (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Other uses of results findings include identifying best practices, supporting economies of scale, avoiding overlap and duplication, and coordinating similar programs across agencies (Wye, 2002). The use of M&E findings can promote knowledge and learning in governments and organizations and also provide important feedback about the progress, as well as the success or failure, of projects, programs, and policies throughout their respective cycles as well as means of capacity development and sustainability of national results (OECD 2001; UNDP, 2002). The value of information often

decreases rapidly over time, so essential findings should be communicated as quickly as possible (Tuft, 2001). Therefore, performance information can make a dramatic contribution to improving government performance if it is effectively communicated to stakeholders, including citizens (Wye, 2002).

2.1.8 Sustaining the M&E System

The critical components crucial to sustaining address such issues as a demand, clear roles and responsibilities, trustworthy and credible information, accountability, capacity and incentives (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Putting in place incentives for M&E means offering stimuli that encourage M&E officers and primary stakeholders to perceive the usefulness of M&E, not as a bureaucratic task, but as an opportunity to discuss problems openly, reflect critically and criticize constructively in order to learn what changes are needed to enhance impact (Hauge, Arild 2001; and IFAD, 2002). Sustaining the M&E system its requirements to provided government departments with tools for very basic ways of conducting business in sensible ways: set performance goals and measure both long and short-term outcomes (Khan Adil, 2001). Any organization seeking to provide improved quality of life, greater quantity of services, and enhanced overall quality of customer services must have a vision and a mission, set goals and objectives, and must measure results (Channah Sorah, 2003). Evaluators can assist in validating performance data and improving performance measurement systems i.e. focus both on the technical quality of the measurement system and on the extent to which performance information is used in managing to achieve performance goals and in providing accountability to key stakeholders and the public (Wholey, 2001).

3. Methodology

The study utilized a case study research design, the researcher chose it because it was considered a vital research method particularly

when a holistic, in-depth investigation was required and was more prominent when issues with regard to community based problems. A questionnaire containing seven questions with five choices on a Likert scale was used for quantitative data collection. Likert scale was used to rate the respondents agreement with statements at a scale of 1-5 which were expressed both positively and negatively and were assumed to have equal value. The Likert scale was used because it was considered more reliable because respondents had more information and answer each statement included into the instrument and permits use of statements that are not manifestly related to the attitude being studied (Kothari, 2004). A purposive sampling technique was used to select 47 respondents who had been involved in the effect of monitoring and evaluation framewrok on the existence of structure on M&E system.

The sample of 47 respondents was envisaged to be a large enough sample to minimize the discrepancy between the sample characteristics and the population characteristics (Mugenda *et al.*, 2003). Qualitative data for triangulation was collected using semi structured interviews with key informants, focused discussion groups with bureau head, planning officers, M&E officers, M&E process owner, finance & logistics process owner, case coordinators, senior officers who were involved in the monitoring and evaluation framwork on the existence of structure M&E on development of educational project. Quantitative data was summarized in tables and expressed as a percentage of the total responses. An analysis of the data was done using a table as descriptive statistics. Analysis was done using MS Excel. Qualitative data was used to support the quantitative data in answering the objective question.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Respondents' Profile

The respondents profile of sample of respondents including their level of gender, age,

education level, and work experience which have been involved in for the last ten years were summarized in the table below:-

		Gender of respondents	
		Frequency	Percent
	Male	32	31.9
	Female	15	68.1
	Total	47	100.0
		Age of respondents	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	18-25	11	23.4
	26-35	16	34.0
	36-45	15	31.9
	46-60	5	10.6
	Total	47	100.0

		Educational level of respondents	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Diploma& below	14	29.9
	Bachelor's degree	29	61.7

	Masters degree or above	4	8.5
	Total	47	100
Work experience of respondents			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1-5	28	59.6
	6-10	12	25.5
	11-20	5	10.6
	Above 30	2	4.3
	Total	47	100

Majority of the respondents at 68.1% were female. The age bracket of between 26-35 years had the highest number of respondents at 34% and lowest at the bracket of age between 46-60 at 10.6%. The education level for majority of the respondents was Bachelor's degree holder at 61.7%. Majority of the work experience of workers who have served for 1-5 years.

4.2 Summary of Responses on the Existence of Structure Monitoring and Evaluation to the Development of Educational Project.

The study sought to find out the existence of structure monitoring and evaluation to the development of educational project in jig-jiga district in for the last ten years. The study shows that the community was not involved in the conducting a readiness assessment of M&E design on educational project and had no knowledge of the existence of such tools. 58% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 30% disagreed on the conducting a readiness assessment of M&E design on educational project. The study established the agreed on monitor outcome determined

before setting indicators in existence structure of M&E tools while 48% disagreed and 33% strongly disagreed having any knowledge on the M & E tools. This was inconsistent with the guidelines of participatory M & E which required inclusive and meaningful participation of all community groups, particularly the most vulnerable, was needed in all the phases of the projects (from assessment to implementation, monitoring and evaluation) (kusek and Rist, 2004).

The study found out that the existing structure of selection of key indicators to measure performance of monitor outcomes in organization. So that community was not involved in M & E quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis to measure indicators. 43% disagreed and 33% strongly disagreed on participation in data collection and analysis to measure indicators. This was improper according to guidelines by education bureau which provided that the stakeholders were to be involved from the design of the M&E framework through to quantitative and qualitative data collection, analysis and feedback(Mugenda, 2003;

Madhakani, 2012). The projects did not meet success indicators which was an indication that the projects did not succeed. 43% of the respondents disagreed and 28% strongly disagreed that the projects met the set success indicators. According to Europe Aid, (2012) impact indicators were used to measure the general objectives in terms of national development and poverty reduction.

From the study, the community had no access to baseline data and any other data for comparison of projects performance. 50% of the participants strongly disagreed while 38% disagreed that the information was available to make comparisons. This was a contravene of supporter requirements that educational projects should always report against the baseline and intermediate measurements to determine whether progress had been sustained, whether there was only a short spurt of improvement, or whether early improvements had all disappeared (World Bank, 2004).

The study found out that selecting performance results targets with regards performance indicators for development of educational project did not succeed. 50% of the participants strongly disagreed while 48% disagreed that educational project were successful and therefore the society had enough educational project. Reports from similar educational funded projects indicated that ownership of projects was only possible when communities participated meaningfully in the development, implementation and management of these projects. The lessons were that beyond accountability and results, communities and those that works with them were able to do things right and make a sustainable difference (IIRR, 2012).

The study revealed that M & E was completely unknown to the community due to lack of participation in any level of the M & E exercises. 55% of the respondents

disagreed that the community understood how to carry M & E in educational project. As to whether the community was involved in reporting and using finding information of projects progress from educational bureau, 60% disagreed that the community was involved in the reporting and using finding information of projects progress. As per Kusek and Rist, (2004) reporting and using finding of the information from M&E, its make the organization that provided information of projects progress to decision makers in a timely manner to make the right decision making. Also, encouraged active stakeholder participation in project formulation, implementation and M&E activities to ensure relevant programming and accountability.

The study revealed that sustaining the M&E system that the community did not clear understand the organization roles and responsibilities, trustworthy, accountability, capacity and incentives for development of educational project. 40% disagreed while 38% strongly disagreed sustaining the M&E system. This was due to the implementing agencies leaving the community out of the M&E system. This contradicted the fact that a sustaining the M&E system offering stimuli that encourage M&E officers and primary stakeholders to perceive the usefulness of M&E, not as a bureaucratic task, but as an opportunity to discuss problems openly, reflect critically and criticize constructively in order to learn what changes are needed to enhance impact (Hauge, Arild 2001; and IFAD, 2002).

5. Conclusion

The overall objective of this study was to find out the effect of monitoring and evaluation framework on development of educationl project in Somali regional state bureau of education in case of Jig-Jiga district. The study has therefore established

that the community was not involved in any monitoring and evaluation of the development of educational project. This was contrary to the clearly set out guidelines and emphasis by supporter on participatory monitoring and evaluation of the projects. The projects were funded subject to demonstration of a clearly outlined M & E framework in the proposed projects. These M & E frameworks were drafted without the community participation. The presence of these M & E guidelines might have encouraged an up-down approach to the development of the projects and the M & E frameworks which made the projects deficient of addressing the community priority needs and the indicators of success were fake. Keeping the community out of the M & E system raised serious questions of integrity, transparency and accountability in the projects on the side of the implementing agencies. The implementing agencies failed to involve the community in the projects of M & E frameworks exercises. The researcher did not establish how and when the implementing agencies collected M & E frameworks data to report project progress to the donors. It was however clear the reports did not provide any learning from previous projects and the community was not involved which led to lack of community ownership and therefore projects failure.

6. Suggestion for Future Research

The donors should ensure the beneficiary's involvement in all M & E framework activities throughout all the stages of the existence structure of M&E. Training to the beneficiaries to build up their capacity to participate productively in the existence structure of M & E structure is critical. This should ensure the financed projects address community priority needs and sufficient community participation to ensure project ownership, sustainability and success.

An independent body should be set up by the donors to be charged with compliance audit to all the activities as outlined in the project proposal, M & E system and compliance to donors' guidelines. The beneficiaries must demand inclusion in all project activities and participation in drafting progress reports to donors.

Reference

- [1].Amjad, S. (2009). Performance- Based Monitoring and Evaluation for Development A
 - a. Outcome; Framework for developing Countries, Washington, DC USA.
- [2].Aune B. (2000). Logical framework approach and mutually exclusive/complementary tools
- [3].for planning. *Journal of Development in practice*, vol 10 No (5), pp 687-690
- [4].Channah Sorah, Vijaya Vinita (2003). Moving from Measuring Processes to Outcome
 - a. Lessons Learned from Guidelines Performance and research development in the Korea Development Institute, Seoul, South Korea. July 24–25.
- [5].Crawford P & Bryce P (2003). Project monitoring and evaluation, A method of Enhancing
 - i. The Efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol 21, No5, pp 363-373
 - ii. *Journal of Project Management*, Vol 21, No5, pp 363-373

- [6]. Dorotinsky, William (2003). Information on Monitoring for Results in Brazil. World Bank. Personal communication with authors, Evaluation System, Washington DC.
- [7]. Europe Aid, (2012). Results-oriented Monitoring handbook.
- [8]. FHI. (2004). Monitoring and evaluation of Behavioral change communication programmes.
a. Washington D.C.
- [9]. Githiomi, L.G., (2010), Strategy monitoring and evaluation at K-REP Bank Ltd, Unpublished
a. MBA Project: University of Nairobi.
- [10]. Gyorkos T. (2003). Monitoring and Evaluation of large scale *Helminthes control*
a. *Programmers. Act a Tropic*, Vol 86, No.2, pp 275-282.
- [11]. Hatry, Harry P. (1999). Performance Measurement, Getting Results. Washington D.C, The Urban Institute Press.
- [12]. Hauge, Arild. (2001). Strengthening Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in Uganda,
a. A Result Based Perspective. World Bank Operations Evaluation Dept, Working Paper Series, Number 8. Washington, D.C. USA.
- [13]. Henry, Gupta and Thomson T. (2006). Evaluation an integrated framework for understanding,
a. Guiding, and improving policies and programs. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Secretariat, San Francisco.
- [14]. Hilhorst, Thea and Guijt, Irene (2006). Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation, a
a. Process to Support Governance and Empowerment at the Local Level. A Guidance Paper, Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- [15]. Hughes-d'Aeth. (2002). Evaluation of HIV/AIDS peer projects in Zambia. *International Journal of Evaluation and Program Planning*. Vol 25 No.4, pp 397-407
- [16]. Hulme, D. (2000). 'Impact Assessment Methodologies for Microfinance. Theory,
a. Experience and Better Practice', *World Development* 28 (1) 79 – 98.
- [17]. International Fund for Agricultural Development. (2002). A Guide for Project M&E,
a. Managing For impact in rural development, Rome.
- [18]. IRR (International Institute of Rural Reconstruction), (2012). Participatory Monitoring,
a. Evaluation and Learning
- [19]. Jody Zall Kusek and Ray C. Rist. (2004). Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and
a. Evaluation System. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- [20]. Kimaiyo, K.E., (2011), Effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of constituency
a. Development funds in Eldoret East Constituency. Unpublished MBA Project: University of Nairobi.

- [21]. Khan, M. Adil. (2001). A Guidebook on Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation,
a. Key Concepts, Issues and Applications. Monitoring and Progress Review Division, Ministry of Plan Implementation, Government of Sri Lanka. Colombo, Sri Lanka
- [22]. Kusek, J.Z. and R.C. Rist,(2001). Making Monitoring and Evaluation Matter, Get then
i. Foundation Right. *International Journal of Evaluation Insights*, Vol. 2, No. 2.
- [23]. Kothari C.R, (2004). Research methodology, methods and techniques.
- [24]. Lawal, T. (2010). Project Management, A Panacea for Reducing the Incidence of Failed
- [25]. Projects in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research*, Volume 2, No. 5.
- [26]. Madhakani, (2012). Implementing Results-Based Management in Zimbabwe, Context &
i. Implications for the Public sector. *International Journal of Human and Social science* vol. 2 No. 8
- [27]. McCoyet , Ngari P and Krumpel E. (2005). Building Monitoring, Evaluations and Reporting
a. Systems for HIV/AIDS Programmes. Washington DC, USAID.
- [28]. NORAD. (1995). Guide to planning and evaluation NGO Projects, Number 2: core
a. Elements in planning development assistance. Oslo, NORAD.
- [29]. Ogwen, S., (2010). Monitoring and evaluation. a comparison between donor funded and
a. Non- donor funded projects in Kenya. Unpublished MBA Project: University of Nairobi.
- [30]. Olive M. Mugenda and Abel G. Mugenda (2003). Research methods: Quantitative and
a. Qualitative approaches.
- [31]. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2001). Evaluation Feedback
a. for Effective Learning and Accountability, Paris.
- [32]. Rakotononahary A, Zoary Rand Bensaïd K.(2002).Qualitative evaluation of HIV/AIDS
a. Activities in Madagascar. *International Journal of Evaluation and Programmed Planning*, Vol. 25(4) pp 341-345.
- [33]. Razmi, J., Sangari, M., & Ghodsi, R. (2009). Developing a practical framework for
i. Readiness Assessment using fuzzy analytic network process. *Advances in Engineering Software*, 40(11), pp1168–1178.
- [34]. Reijer P, Chalimba M and Nakwagala. A.(2002). Malawi goes full scale with anti AIDS

- a. clubs and popular media. Evaluation and Program Planning, Vol. 25(4), pp357-363. Retrieved on March 2011, from www.SPSS for Psychologists.
- [35]. Rist, R.C. (2000). "Evaluation Capacity Development in the People's Republic of China,
- a. Trends and Prospects in Asia. United Nations Development Program Evaluation Office, New York.
- [36]. Roger Edmunds and Tim Merchants. (2008). Official statistics and monitoring and Evaluation
- a. Systems in developing countries. The partnership in statistics for development in the 21st century Paris, France
- [37]. Shapiro J. (2004): Monitoring and Evaluation. Johannesburg, CIVICUS
- [38]. Stem C., Margoluis, R., Salafsky, N and Brown, M. (2005). Monitoring and Evaluation in
- i. Conservation. USA, Maryland Avenue.
- [39]. Suresh B. and A. Ergeneman, (2005). African Journal of Food Agriculture and Nutritional
- i. Development (AJFAND): Volume 5 No 2 2005.
- [40]. Tufte, Edward R. (2001). The Visual Display of Quantitative Information. Cheshire,
- i. Conn Graphics Press.
- [41]. Uitto JA. (2004). Multi-country co-operation around shared waters: Role of Monitoring
- a. And Evaluation. Global environmental change, Vol 14 (1) pp 5-14.
- [42]. UNDP (2002). A Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation Results. UNDP, Evaluation
- a. Office. New York.
- [43]. USAID. (2000). Building a Results Framework. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.
- i. Washington D.C.
- [44]. Webb D and Elliot L, (2000). Monitoring and evaluation of HIV/AIDS programmes for
- a. Young people, Save the Children Fund, London.
- [45]. Wholey, Joseph S. (2001). Managing for Results, Roles for Evaluators in a New
- a. Management Era. The American Journal of Evaluation. vol 22(3) pp 343-347
- [46]. Wye, Chris. (2002). Performance Management, A Start Where You Are, Use What You
- i. Have Guide. Arlington, IBM Endowment for Business in Government. Managing for Results Series.