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ABSTRACT

This study sought to investigate factors affecting monitoring and evaluation in county government projects initiated by Kisii County government. The study was carried out within Kisii County; thus the elected members of county assembly (MCA) and resident engineer formed target population. There were 45 elected members of county assembly and one resident engineer per constituency from which a random sample of 40 personnel were sought for the study. The study employed questionnaire interview format as its primary data collection method. The study informed both the county and national government of factors affecting monitoring and evaluations in county government projects funded by county and played vital role in strategic planning for county infrastructure development. The study established that involvement of community on monitoring and evaluation in Kisii county government projects constituted the core of a monitoring and evaluation framework which enhanced a participatory process of selecting legal procedures for stakeholders involved with project implementation. The study established that there was an effect of budgetary allocation on effective monitoring and evaluation which enhanced adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities through evaluation planning budget which carefully estimated actual expenditure on the evaluation of more projects to be monitored. The study established that the skills of a project manager affected monitoring and evaluation through technical capacity as a huge determinant of how monitoring & evaluation’s lessons were produced, communicated and perceived. The study established that legal procedures affected monitoring and evaluation in those legal procedures. Kisii county employees were supportive towards monitoring and evaluation practices and that the legal procedures in projects which were undertaken in Kisii were supportive of M & E practices. The study recommended that; The Kisii county officers should allocate sufficient financial resources to enhance on monitoring and evaluation of projects implemented by county government through organizational policies and discipline to enhance the process. Proper rules, laws and regulation should formulated by the county governments in order to enhance people in rural areas in implementation of sustainable projects in Kisii county. Proper infrastructure should be established in Kisii County to be used on enhancing monitoring and evaluation of county government projects in Kisii County.
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INTRODUCTION

Project management is the application of skills, knowledge, techniques and tools to research activities to achieve project objectives. Project management is accomplished through the application, utilisation, and integration of the project management activities of initiating, planning, executing, monitoring and controlling, and closing” (PMBOK, 2004,) as cited by James (2007). A research project on the other hand, is a semi-permanent endeavour with a defined start and end. The end of the project is always constrained by factors like time, deliverables, and funds. A research project is undertaken to meet unique objectives and goals (Nokes, 2007). Project controlling function has three steps that describe evaluation and monitoring practices. The controlling activities include defining standards, weighing performance against the established standards, and adjusting deviations noted from the standards and general plans. Recently, there has been an increased recognition in that an effective project management is associated with a well-designed evaluation and monitoring system (Margoluis, 1998). Therefore, it is highly recognisable that evaluation and monitoring is integral to the achievement of the purpose of any given project. According to author Dyason (2010) monitoring is the continuous collection and regular analysis of information relating to a project program or an intervention. On the other hand, evaluation is the process of assessment that focuses on answering given questions about an intervention or program. The various definitions express monitoring as an ongoing process majorly based on the set targets and activities planned during the planning phases of project work. Monitoring helps to keep the project operations on track, and acts as a benchmark to countercheck the performance as per schedule. Monitoring is a good management tool if well done and it provides a great base for evaluation of the activities. The process of evaluation helps discover if the resources needed are sufficient and the capacity set is enough for the project execution. Evaluation as defined is more about the results/outcomes and impact of the project. Evaluation is a periodic assessment of the change in targeted population through observation of the chosen Legal procedures with comparison to the project interventions (Goyder, 2009). The main purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to identify whether the goals of the project are achieved. Monitoring and evaluation are used interchangeably different but they give information of a project at different stages. The monitoring process provides an early indication of the progress of the project, determining whether the expected results are achievable or change of plan is needed to improve operation (Goyder, 2009). On the other hand, evaluation provides information on the project at specific stages as well as at its completion stage. Assessment endeavours to connecting a specific yield or result straight forwardly to a mediation after a span of time has passed. Assessment helps program or venture administrators focus the quality or worth of a particular program or undertaking that is expense adequacy and money saving advantage of a specific program or task, (Global trust, 2004). In this way, the procedures of checking and assessment are particular however they supplement one another through illuminating one another and thus should be deliberately gotten ready for their viability. Observing and Evaluation procedure, guarantees that the venture/project results at levels of effect, result, yield, process and information can be measured to give the premise to responsibility and educated choice making at both system and arrangement levels.

The Ministry of Finance (MOF) of China which is driving on the planet's financial development communicated the astuteness to reinforce
instruments of Monitoring and Evaluation to guarantee trusts are well-spent (Wong, 2012). Observing and Evaluation was additionally utilized widely as a part of the USA government to quantify its execution (Pfeiffer, 2011). This is demonstrative of the noteworthiness of Monitoring and assessment in all nature of ventures. The major phase in the evolution of M&E in Kenya was the introduction of the Kenya Vision 2030 in 2008, which replaced the Economic recovery Strategy (ERS) as the country’s development blueprint. Vision 2030 has since been the principle driver of development in Kenya and therefore the basis for National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES). When in 2008, Kenya Vision 2030 as the national developmental policy replaced ERS; NIMES was re-oriented to M&E of the implementation of the Vision. According to Republic of Kenya, 2012, the M&E responsibility was at this time, however, divided between Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED) and a new tailor made body, within the then, Ministry of Planning that organises flagship programs and projects in Kenya’s economic blueprint Vision 2030.

The Kenya Vision 2030 Board and its Secretariat was founded for the purpose of economic growth and development. NIMES was designed to have a three tier institutional relationship for generating M&E information. At the national level is MED, that provides, coordinates and offers leadership to the system by ensuring that two crucial sources of M&E information; Annual Progress Reports (APRs) on the Medium Term Plan (MTP) of Vision 2030 and Annual Public Expenditure Review (PER) are ably and timely produced. At ministerial level are the Central Project Planning and Monitoring Units (CPPMUs). Ministerial Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports and the Ministerial Public Expenditure Reviews and are synthesized into the APR and PER respectively. The District Development Officers (DDO) headed the sub-national level, and was supervised by the Provincial Directors of Planning. Both the DDO and provincial Directors were subjected to submitting District Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports (GoK, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

Monitoring and evaluation has been a pivotal performance management for planning, decision making and economic policy management. As such many countries are putting measures to ensure that there is effective M&E. Mackay (2007) asserts that most governments in the world are working towards entrenching M&E in their economic governance system. In this regard, in the Kenyan devolved system of county governments and the rising fiscal devolution with respect to development policies, programs and projects, there is dire need for an effective national wide M&E framework. Further, with decentralization of accountability in light of the new governance structure in Kenya, line managers have become more responsible for non-core functions, such as human resource development and equity. The key strategic challenge is to increase public service effectiveness, so that the entire government achieves her desired policy outcomes and strategic objectives. This makes national wide M&E in Kenya critically important. An observation from the existing literature point out that in Sub-Saharan Africa substantial M&E achievements on the ground are rare (Mackay, 2007; UNICEF, 2009; World Bank, 1999). Musomba, Keronga, Mutua and Kilika (2013) argue that the M&E of decentralized development in Kenya was not systematic, failed to adopt the M&E requirements and the information generated was not timely and accurate. This is an indicator that all the significant variables that determine effective monitoring and evaluation may not have been identified by already set policy measures. Campo (2005) acknowledged that it takes time to build an effective M&E system, noting that
strengthening of institutions and learning from mistakes plays a key role. Therefore M&E has emerged as a key policy development and performance management tool in economics which is aimed at reducing economic risks and uncertainties to enhance optimal resource utilization. The economic policy makers need the information generated from M&E functions to improve their economic policies while donors and stakeholders need M&E findings to ensure accountability of resources and improving the effectiveness of the policy implementations (Mackay, 2007). In order to accurately and timely track the development progress made in Kenya and the 47 counties in particular, there is need for an integrated national wide M&E system. The absence of this framework limits effective public service delivery thus constraining the acceleration of economic development in Kenya and therefore impacts negatively on the overall welfare of the citizens. The factors affecting effective M&E of county government projects in Kenya therefore need to be timely established to guide the implementation of M&E function and policy development in Kenya. Most studies done in Kenya on M&E focus on County development fund which has a unique and distinct structure from that of devolved county governance therefore it is difficult to generalize their findings to projects in the new devolved system of governance being funded by county government and this study aimed at filling the noted gap.

Objectives

The general objective of this study was to establish factors affecting monitoring and evaluation in county government projects. The specific Objectives of the Study were:

- To identify how budgetary allocation affect M&E in county government projects in Kisii County.
- To determine how skills of the project manager affect M&E in county government projects in Kisii County.
- To assess how legal procedures affect monitoring and evaluation in Kisii county projects.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

Theory of Change

The first Theory examined is the Theory of Change. It defines all building blocks required to bring about a given long-term goal. This set of connected building blocks—interchangeably referred to as outcomes, results, accomplishments, or preconditions is depicted on a map known as a pathway of change/change framework, which is a graphic representation of the change process. Built around the pathway of change, a Theory of Change describes the types of interventions (a single program or a comprehensive community initiative) that bring about the outcomes depicted in the pathway of a change map. Each outcome in the pathway of change is tied to an intervention, revealing the often complex web of activity that is required to bring about change as envisaged by implementation of projects in county government.

McClelland Achievement Needs Theory

While the trait model focuses on enduring inborn qualities and locus of control on the individual's perceptions about the rewards and punishments in his or her life, (Pervin, 1980), need for achievement theory by McClelland (1961) explained that human beings have a need to succeed, accomplish, excel or achieve. Entrepreneurs are driven by this need to
achieve and excel. While there is no research evidence to support personality traits, there is evidence for the relationship between achievement motivation and entrepreneurship (Johnson, 1990). Achievement motivation may be the only convincing person logical factor related to new venture creation (Shaver & Scott, 1991).

**Freirean Theory of Dialogue and Society**

This project is based on the third theory under review that is the Freirean theory of dialogue and society, and the major economics models of project assignment. The Paolo Freire’s theory of dialogue (Freire, 1970) states that dialogue, particularly between leaders and community, is essential to liberation and education of the masses by challenging historically held methods via the use of critical thought. Critical thought raises consciousness and questions the assumption that people should fall into established routines or systems, rather than help to form new systems that better address their needs especially concerning projects intended to better their lives. This emphasis on conscious, collaborative action gives power to community members motivated to redefine aspects of their cognitive systems. Whether by negligence, lack of budget, lack of motivation, or simple ignorance, there are disparities in implementation of projects in county government. Freire’s emphasis on dialogue is reflected in this project by my advocacy for community involvement with the development and management of CGPs in order to ensure continuity and provision of basic amenities even after phase out. Community members deserve not only to be part of the project design and implementation, but to be explicitly invited to that process and thus get involved in the solutions. Additionally, information about these mechanisms must be presented in accessible language, and with appropriate context. This study will be anchored on this theory and serve as a bridge from the inaccessible and often intimidating language of development agencies to the people most affected by the discussion: communities.

**Conceptual Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary allocation in M&amp;E</td>
<td>Budget allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget adequacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timely disbursement of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills of project manager</td>
<td>Skills on procurement skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills on risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills on Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal procedures</td>
<td>Tendering Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework**

**Empirical Review**

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

There are several distinct purposes for monitoring and evaluation (Failing & Gregory, 2003; Stem et al., 2005). Managers are not always clear on which purpose and its corresponding approach is most suitable to meet specific program needs (Stem et
Monitoring and evaluation can be used for accountability purposes (Moynihan, 2005). It can be used to indicate project compliance with required parameters and demonstrate to donors, or the public that resources have been used appropriately. In accountability orientated M&E high levels of scrutiny are expected, and judgment generally made against clear standards and norms that have been established for a range of performance areas. This would include the proper management of budgets, personnel, legal and regulatory compliance with process and procedures and as in the case of South Africa, transformational and ethical considerations (Cook, 2006). In this context monitoring and evaluation can be viewed as supporting a governance function, which Cook (2006) notes “encompasses the entire management, operating systems and culture of an institution”. M&E also links to government if supported by a strong government auditing system. Improving governmental management is yet another reason evaluation is employed in government (Davies et al, 2006). Furthermore, the importance given to M&E by governments in Africa, as part of their process of improving their efficiencies, indicates recognition that change cannot be driven without appropriate tools that generate strategic management information. In addition to, M&E serving the very necessary purpose of accountability it is meant to promote the “learning organization”. This would be at the level of M&E use, and comes about when results are communicated or shared to the stakeholders. The assumption is that organizations would become more open and self-reflective when faced with evaluative information, but it is not necessarily the case as operationalizing learning is not easy, given the complex array of protocols and management culture which must be negotiated (Preskill & Russ-Eft, 2005). Utilizing evaluation in organizations is, however, not easy, and is influenced by several factors: contextual (political), technical (methodological) and bureaucratic (psychological). These factors overlap, but unless “all the elements are lined up, organizational learning is difficult” (Mayne, 2000). Tuckerman (2007) evaluates this grouping taking into consideration how M&E contributes to learning and reflection, and notes that in this mode M&E is seen as but one tool that supports management by improving the quality of information provided for decision-making. There is much potential for evaluation to lead to organizational learning, and not just accountability, which has been illustrated by Gray (2009). The key point is that the reason behind monitoring and evaluation is very important, as it could lead to different outcomes. It should be remembered that M&E has assumed different identities, due to context, and depending on this it may be used for accountability, promoting a behaviour or practice, or learning, as demonstrated in a series on the subject (Bemelemans-Videc Marie-Louise, Rist & Vedung, 2007). Within the context of asking the question, what is the purpose of M&E, there are dilemmas as it often shares an identity with auditing, especially when it assumes an accountability function (Bemelmans-Videc et al, 2007). In some cases M&E focuses on assessing the condition of biological or socioeconomic criteria to improve existing information about factors of concern, such as health or population levels (Salzer & Salafsky, 2006). Stem et al. (2005) refer to these as status assessment approaches to M&E. In the field of natural resource conservation, status assessment approaches help managers decide where to focus management efforts by providing information about threats to species or other ecosystem related factors. The findings from status assessment M&E can influence policy and management decisions at broader levels (Stem et al., 2005). Typically, however, status assessment is not linked to specific management activities. That is, status assessment M&E does not provide direct feedback on the effectiveness of specific programs.
or policies (Salzer & Salafsky, 2006). The Millennium Development Goals project (United Nations, 2000), is an example of a global scale status assessment approach to M&E that is intended to measure progress toward sustainability and influence policy decisions at the international level. M&E is referred to by Failing and Gregory (2003) as tracking performance and by Stem et al. (2005) as effectiveness measurement. This approach to M&E is intended to measure the impacts of management actions in order to provide feedback on progress toward goals and the effectiveness of program interventions and provide insight into relevant remedy. In effectiveness measurement, performance frameworks such as results-based and adaptive management incorporate the results of M&E into project cycles designed to facilitate continual improvement (Moynihan, 2005). A common challenge for resource managers is deciding how many resources to allocate toward effectiveness measurement M&E versus the status assessment approach mentioned above (Salzer & Salafsky, 2006). Failing et.al. (2003) give another purpose for monitoring and evaluation. They assert that M&E can be used in a decision analysis context to provide insight for choosing amongst a range of policy options. In this case Legal procedures are designed to be used as decision criteria. They however, caution that significant misunderstanding can exist around the difference between M&E for decision making and M&E for tracking performance. Ramothamo, (2013) points out that Monitoring and evaluation gives Legal procedures on whether the project is progressing or not and if there are any obstacles that needs corrective measures. It does this by providing data which is useful for policy-making and advocacy. As such, it is an aid to plan future resource needs and activities hence monitoring and evaluation is the fundamental tool of good programme management at all levels because it provides data on project progress and the effectiveness of activities. International Finance Corporation, (2006) also sees monitoring and evaluation to be part of design of programs because it ensures systematic reporting; the process communicates results and shows accountability. “It measures efficiency and effectiveness, ensures effective allocation of resources, promotes continuous learning and improvement and provides information for improved decision making” (IFC, 2006). In agreement, (Bartle 2007) emphasized that monitoring and evaluation should be done at all levels of the project. Ramothamo, (2013) concludes that evaluation will help in the accountability and decision making for future and current projects.

**Involvement of Community**

Community involvement has been described as the basic beliefs commonly held and learned by a group, that govern the group members thoughts, perceptions, actions and feelings, that are typical for the group members( Sackmann, 2003). Community involvement describes a complex pattern of beliefs, ideas, expectations, values, behaviours, and attitude shared by the members for projects being implemented in their areas (Trice & Banjer, 1984). Pearson and Robinson (2006) refer to community involvement as the set of important assumptions that an organisation share in common. Community involvement is similar to an individual’s personality- an intangible yet ever present theme that provide direction, meaning, and the basis for relevant actions which can enhance success of projects implemented. The shared assumptions (beliefs and values) among a firms members influence opinions within that firm or community. Farson and Keyes (2002), suggests that fostering failure tolerance is a crucial way of promoting an innovation enabling culture in communities for effective monitoring and evaluation of projects. However, to foster failure tolerance requires the associated leaders to be engaged and express interest in people’s work by asking pertinent
question, express support and give feedback, and are collaborative rather than controlling. In many communities members identify risks and opportunities based on their own perceptions of the project’s internal and external environment, the integrate resources, and bring in new individuals to help them understand creative and innovative ventures which can enhance monitoring and evaluation (Sternberg, Kaufman & Pretz, 2003; Mumford & Licuanan, 2004, & Chen; 2007). Bounded delegation leaders enhance implementation and evaluation by developing a sharing community culture that facilitates interaction and sharing of information among individuals across the community (damanpour, 1991; Ahmed, 1998; Mcdermott, 199; Menzel, et al., 2008). These interactions and information sharing are great means of allowing community members opinions and views to be expressed concerning the project. These activities also help in sharing of knowledge among the members (Menzel et al., 2008). Damanpour (1991) notes internal communication as crucial to community innovativeness, and McDermott (1999) added that it is important in developing existing knowledge of the communities to facilitate understanding and information sharing on projects being implemented in their areas. A sharing culture makes communication, interaction, and knowledge transfer possible (Damanpour, 1991; Ahmed, 1998; McDermott, 1999; Menzel et.al., 2008), in turn supported exploratory behaviour and learning. The culture of a community is expected to be supportive of and consistent with the projects being implemented (Johnson and Scholes, 1999).

**Budgetary Allocation**

According to Gyorkos, (2003) and McCoy (2005), the project budget should provide a clear and adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities. A monitoring and evaluation budget can be compared to the actual budget at the end of the project to compare the actual performance of close monitoring and evaluation in project management. Kelly & Magongo, (2004) provide a definite proportion of the total budget that M&E should get and they state that a monitoring and evaluation budget should be between 5 to 10 percentages of the total budget. The Program Evaluation Standards also indicates that, evaluation planning budget could certainly be more carefully estimated and actual expenditure on the evaluation more carefully monitored (James, 2001). Smith & Chircop (1993) say that solid and systematic learning is costly. Money is required for workforce, support data system management, training programs, transport, and other activities involved. Major items to be included in the budget are the outsourcing resource expenses. Institutions outsource for expertise, and other skills that are not available to the existing personnel. Other expenses include physical non contractual investment costs, recurrent labour cost, focused labour input, training and study tours for M&E related capacity building, and non-operational costs like stationery, meetings, allowances for primary stakeholders and project implementers. In the recent past, donors have put emphasis on ensuring that monitoring and evaluation is budgeted for before approving any proposals for funding. In contrast, implementing agencies put little or no emphasis at all towards M&E and most of them try to resist having structures that can support M&E in their organizations. According to African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (2012), the directorate has been challenged in terms of human resources and financial capacity hence the inability to build a full functional M&E system that was envisaged when National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) was initially created. When NIMES was launched and later re-oriented from ERS to Kenya Vision 2030, Kenya’s decision-makers envisaged a comprehensive M&E system for greatly improving
transparency and accountabilities and therefore generation of information required to measure results and impact of national policies. That vision of Monitoring & Evaluation Director (MED) led to projection of substantial resources for implementing Kenya’s M&E system. Applying inadequate resources to a given activity slows progress whereas applying excessive resources causes crowding hence reducing productivity and increasing embezzlement. Therefore, the effective and efficient allocation of adequate resources is a realistic management opportunity for improving project planned performance (John, 2007). Due to various unforeseen events, however, including the political crisis of 2007-2008 and the ensuing economic setback, the vision of NIMES was sharply scaled back. The MED budget for 2011 was Kshs119 million (or US$1.3 million) that includes the wage bill, office rental, and other administrative costs and does not match Kenya’s ambitious M&E agenda (Republic of Kenya, 2011). It is estimated that about US$400,000 is what is left of MED’s budget to dedicate to M&E work in a sharp contrast to US$3.8 million projected for 2011. As a result the current head count of MED’s staffing is sixteen economists and three communications officers, sharing the responsibility of the agency’s five divisions of data collection, research and results analysis, capacity development, project monitoring and advocacy work (Republic of Kenya, 2011). It is estimated that about US$400,000 is what is left of MED’s budget to dedicate to M&E work. The current monitoring and evaluation reality in Kenya is therefore in sharp contrast to what was planned in the 2007 M&E Master Plan. With regards to human capital, it is still a challenge for a directorate staffed by 19 officers to provide leadership and manage a national M&E system that incorporates the 47 counties in Kenya, catering to the needs of a population of close to 40 million. The combination of the human resource and budgetary restraints undermine MED’s successes in the PER and APR – often these products are not available in time thereby reducing their value considerably. Efforts are underway to synchronise PER with budgetary cycle so that the exercise can make an even bigger influence in terms of informing decisions. In effect the mandate of MED in Kenya is unclear (African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, 2012),

Skills of Project Manager

According to (Vanessa & Gala, (2011) the technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations determines how monitoring and evaluation is communicated or perceived. There are other contributing factors to this attribute like; personnel motivation, their value, and participation in the institute’s policymaking process. Building an adequate supply of human resource capacity is critical for the sustainability of the M&E system. It needs to be recognized that “growing" evaluators requires far more technically oriented M&E training and development than can usually be obtained with one or two workshops. Both formal training and on-the-job experience are important in developing evaluators. Two key competencies for evaluators are cognitive capacity and communication skills (Gladys, Katia, Lycia, & Helena, 2010). Program officers and managers are great audiences for less technical training on M&E. The management personnel need to have enough understanding to trust and use M&E information. This type of broad training or orientation is crucial in building a results culture in organizations. Investment in training and systems development is long term. Various options for training and development opportunities include the public sector, the private sector, universities, professional associations, job assignment, and mentoring programs (Gladys, et.al. 2010). In introducing an M&E system, champions and advocates are needed to sustain the commitment needed over the long term. Identifying good practices and benchmarking help avoid the fatigue
that typically accompanies any change process, as enthusiasm starts to wane over time. Evaluation professionals have the needed skills in providing functional guidance and advice to departmental managers on the development and designing of suitable results-based performance monitoring systems. Whereas, managers are responsible for performance efficient measurement and monitoring, a recognized role for evaluators should be to provide such assistance and oversight on results measurement and monitoring (Gladys et al. 2010). Mukherjee (1993) says that meeting capacity needs will be ensured by acquiring the right people, by hiring already trained people, training your staff, hiring external consultants for focused inputs and also ensure the capacity of good quality through removing disincentives and introducing incentives for learning, keeping track of staff performance through regular evaluation, striving for continuity of staff and finding highly qualified person to coordinate. Human resources should be given clear job designation and allocation according to their expertise and if inadequate then training should be done. For projects where staff is sent out in the fields it is important to provide constant intensive on-site support to them (Ramesh, 2002). One of the major strategy in developing personnel abilities and skills is the focus of the actual organizational on improving their status for better. The skills should help the staff members individually or the organisation. The development and growth efforts increase the quality of the employee output in the organization (Pearce & Robinson, 2004). Taking a micro and Macro look at capacity building suggests that capacity development goes beyond a simple technical intervention. To a great extent focused on inducing behaviour change, a process that involves learning, moderating attitudes, and possibly adopting new values at individual, organization, and system levels. Therefore, the focus of capacity building interventions and M&E must capture related conditions and concepts such as motivation, culture, and commitment, as well as changes in resource availability, skill levels and management structure (Morgan, 1997). Additionally, evaluation must be independent and relevant to the topic of research. Independence is achievable if undertaken by different entities from those undertaking design and implementation of the development relevant interventions (OECD, 2002, Gaarder & Briceno, 2010). Research has shown that it is vital to determine what methods are appropriate to the user’s needs, issues of data, given context, Legal procedures, and baseline (Hulme, 2000). Capacity building will typically include: upgrading conceptual and analytical skills in monitoring and evaluation, selection of Legal procedures, data collection methods, data management and design of reporting systems. Also and perhaps most important, capacity building will include developing a result oriented management culture that seeks out and effectively uses information in decision making. Research has shown that partners pay a lot of emphasis on qualifications of individuals during the recruitment process but nothing is done to improve the staff once they are on board. With changing dynamics in Monitoring and evaluation, organizations need to implement a continuous improvement strategy when staffs are taken through skill that can make them be efficient.

**Legal Procedures**

According to William et al. (2001) legal procedures constitute the core of a monitoring and evaluation framework. These might measure, for example, how much technical assistance is provided to a group. The first task in monitoring is to establish target levels of inputs. Target levels are estimates of quantities of inputs which will be provided to a project or activity in order to achieve the project’s objectives. Throughout the life of the project inputs will be tracked and measured to determine
whether, and to what extent, implementation plans are being followed. Evaluation also uses legal procedures, but these are different to the ones used in the monitoring process. Evaluation legal procedures are designed to measure what comes out of the project or activity. They can be used to measure outputs, results and outcomes. According to Yumi & Susan (2007) the purposes of legal procedures are; to provide a clear means of measuring achievement, to reflect changes, and to help assess the performance. Legal procedures can be classified as either quantitative and/or qualitative. Legal procedure is information that focuses on how a project program is implemented. Legal procedure is a piece of information which communicates a certain state, trend, warning or progress to the audience. The Legal procedures thus determine the quality of evaluation such that inappropriate legal procedures would lead to an unfairly negative evaluation which would terminate a program that was, in fact, making several important contributions to the community. The process of identification of Legal procedures should be critically done. According to William et. al. (2001) a participatory process of selecting legal procedure should involve stakeholders that are directly involved with project implementation, and have a great experience in M&E professionalism. That capability greatly enhances professionalism in the process. One approach is to present to stakeholders a menu of possible legal procedures listing the advantages and disadvantages of each. Second is to generate, from scratch, a list of desired legal procedures from the stakeholders themselves. These may include some legal procedures that do not necessarily reflect the project objectives. Thirdly is to minimize the total participation population and ensure diversity in their professional skills while choosing legal procedures. Regardless of the technique used, the legal procedures generated for project M&E should be reviewed to make certain that they are appropriate before being incorporated into a data collection system. M&E staff needs to select a set of legal procedures which are deemed appropriate for project M&E such that when taken as a whole they provide enough information to assess implementation or the effect of the project. This process demands finding a balance between the practical and the ideal subjects with relevant collection maintained. It is crucial to have diversified legal procedures that greatly represent all the concerned population for better analysis of the inputs, results, impact, and assumptions of the project (William et. al. 2001). According to James et. al. (1999) Legal procedures should not be complex, they should be able to identify and classify. The essence of variables should not be compromised for they will affect clear identification of legal procedures. A project management process is costly financially, labour, and in time consumption, therefore legal procedures should be done well to ensure viability of the project. In a field setting, direct measures of some variables are often impractical or impossible to gather. In such cases it is necessary to rely on indirect, proxy Legal procedures. The measures used in M&E must be clearly and precisely defined. It is not sufficient, for instance, to use “percent of underweight children” as an M&E legal procedures (James et. al. 1999). Legal procedures should be measurable, whether they are quantitative or qualitative in nature. Height and weight are directly measurable; access to piped water can be measured simply by observation once “access” is defined (e.g., available inside the household; available within 250 yards of the house). Often, a scale or index needs to be created to measure a qualitative variable in quantitative terms. Some Legal procedures are essential in one project but may be less important in another. For example, the construction material used to build a house in the rural areas may dictate the state of economic status of a family. A family living in a mud house may be considered poorer than living in a concrete one. This fact is applicable in rural areas but cannot
be used in the urban areas where all the people live in concrete houses. The urban legal procedures may change to factors like regions and facilities like those living in less developed regions, crowded areas, undeveloped areas as compared to the ones in fully developed regions (James et. al. 1999). Legal procedures should reliable so as to maintain consistency on the results of evaluation no matter how many different people or entities perform the evaluation process. To ensure reliability legal procedures must be keenly selected in any given project. That is why it is advisable to have an M&E proficient person in the selection of legal procedures. However, it is important to note that reliable Legal procedures do change with changing variables over given time (James et. al. 1999).

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study was conducted through a descriptive survey research design as conceptualized by Kothari (2004). In a descriptive survey research objectives are predetermined in which case it allows data collection relevant and sufficient to the study problem. By combining both quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures, a descriptive research design allows the researcher to gather information in a manner that reduces cost of data collection. The study targeted the county personnel involved in county funded projects these are the 43 employees 4 resident engineers within the county.

Data was analysed using the following analytical model: The model was as follows the dependent variable was the project sustainability

\[
Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4
\]

Where

\(Y\) = dependent or explained variable of level of monitoring and evaluation

\(a\) = constant or the y-intercept

\(\beta_1\) = is the rate at which changes in community involvement explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation

\(\beta_2\) = is the rate at which changes in the Budgetary allocation explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation

\(\beta_3\) = is the rate at which changes in skills of the project manager explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation

\(\beta_4\) = is the rate at which changes in legal explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation

\(X_1\) = Community involvement

\(X_2\) = Budgetary allocation

\(X_3\) = Skills of the project manager

\(X_4\) = Legal procedures

While \(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\) and \(\beta_4\) are coefficients of determination

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation Process**

The study sought to establish on the participation in monitoring and evaluation process among stakeholders in Kisii County Government. Majority of the respondents 76.3% indicated that they were involved in participation in monitoring and evaluation implementation while 23.7% of the respondents said that they were not involved the participation in monitoring and evaluation implementation. This indicated that participation in monitoring and evaluation had an effect in
monitoring and evaluation in county government projects. Bartle (2007) indicates that participation in monitoring is a management tool that is used to follow up on the laid project plan to ensure all is as planned and where there are challenges a solution is sought and lessons learned from the same.

Involvement of Community

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the involvement of community on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects at Kisii County Government. From the findings, the rating of 4.34 of the respondents said that during the monitoring and evaluation the community was involved in the designing process was a strategy that was involvement of community on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects at Kisii County Government. Rating of 4.42 of the respondents said that community involved in the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation was a strategy that was involvement of community on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects at Kisii County Government. Rating of 4.21 of the respondents said that involving the community in projects evaluations was a strategy that was an effect of involvement of community on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects at Kisii County Government. Hence the findings indicated that involvement of community had a strong effect on monitoring and evaluation of county based projects. Based on the investigated elements of community involvement namely: involvement of community constitutes the core of a monitoring and evaluation framework, a participatory process of selecting legal procedures involves stakeholders involved with project implementation, it was often difficult to assign a monetary value to the outcomes of a project, the study determined that it was often difficult to assign a monetary value to the outcomes of a project which affected negatively on monitoring and evaluation. Bartle (2007) indicated that community involvement in monitoring and evaluation enhanced observation and recording of activities taking place in a project or program. It enhanced a continuous process of gathering and analysing information on all existing aspects of a project which involved the communication of the progress to all that were concerned with the project- stakeholders; they could be the donors, beneficiaries and implementers.

Budgetary Allocation

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the effects of budgetary allocation that enhanced on effective monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Kisii County Government. A rating of 4.08 of the respondents indicated that budgetary allocations for monitoring and evaluations were enough was an effect of budgetary allocation that enhanced on effective monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Kisii County Government, that rating of 4.0 of the respondents indicated that the amount allocated for M&E was adequate was an effect of budgetary allocation that enhanced on effective monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Kisii County Government, that rating of 4.39 of the respondents indicated that disbursement of the amount allocated for M&E is timely was an effect of budgetary allocation that enhanced on effective monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Kisii County Government. Hence the findings indicated that budgetary allocation had a strong effect on monitoring and evaluation of county based projects. Based on the investigated elements of community involvement namely: budgetary allocation should have adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities, evaluation planning budget should certainly be more carefully estimated and actual expenditure on the evaluation more carefully monitored and donors put emphasis on ensuring
that monitoring and evaluation is budgeted for before approving any proposals for funding, it is often difficult to evaluate planning budget on actual expenditure on the evaluation which affected negatively on implementation monitoring and evaluation. Stem et al., (2005) indicate that budget allocation develops human resources and improves management capabilities in planning and implementation of the project and lessons learned may be applied to other projects. It measures the effectiveness and reliability of programs and influences on future programs, and helps in decision making. Budget allocation in monitoring and evaluation can be used for accountability purposes. It can also be used to indicate project compliance with required parameters and demonstrate to donors, or the public that resources have been used appropriately.

**Skills of Project Manager**

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the influence of skills of project manager on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects in Kisii County. Majority of the respondents involved in the study indicated that manager’s skills influenced on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects. This was supported by a huge number of respondents rating 4.34 saying that the project manager was well skilled on procurement procedures was an influence of skills of project manager on monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County Government. Rating 4.42 of the respondents said that the project manager was trained on risk management was an influence of skills of project manager on monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County Government. Rating 4.21 of the respondents said that the manager had the relevant project management skills was an influence of skills of project manager on monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County Government. Emphasis by donors on qualification of individuals on recruitment process negatively affected monitoring and evaluation of county government projects which was rated at 3.90. International Finance Corporation, (2006) sees project manager’s skills on monitoring and evaluation to be part of design of programs because it ensures systematic reporting; process communication results and shows accountability. It further indicated that project manager’s skills measures efficiency and effectiveness that ensures effective allocation of resources, promotes continuous learning and improvement and provides information for improved decision making (IFC, 2006).

**Legal Procedures**

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the legal procedures that affected on monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County Government projects. A rating 3.92 of the respondents said that the tendering procedures used in implementation of M & E projects were open to scrutiny and question by the public in the county was a legal procedure that affected on monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County Government projects. Rating 3.92 of the respondents said that the administration/leadership in Kisii county is abiding legal procedure on implementation of the monitoring and evaluation projects was a legal procedures that affected on monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County Government projects. Rating 4.26 of the respondents said that the county government adhere to the project procedures was a legal procedures that affected on monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County Government projects. Based on the investigated elements of legal procedures namely: legal procedures on supportive towards monitoring and evaluation practices, legal procedures in projects being undertaken, leadership style is supportive to legal procedure and information being shared freely between the staff members, it is often effective for leadership style to
be supportive on legal procedure which affected on the implementation monitoring and evaluation of county government projects. Failing et.al. (2003) in his study indicated that in decision analysis context to provide insight for choosing amongst a range of policy options there are legal procedures designed to be used as decision criteria. Ramothamo, (2013) points out that monitoring and evaluation gives legal procedures on whether the project is progressing or not and if there are any obstacles that needs corrective measures. It does this by providing data which is useful for policy-making and advocacy. As such, it is an aid to plan future resource needs and activities hence monitoring and evaluation is the fundamental tool of good programme management at all levels because it provides data on project progress and the effectiveness of activities.

**Level of Monitoring and evaluation of Roads**

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the level in percentage of monitoring and evaluation of road projects at Kisii County Government. 39.5% of the respondents said that monitoring and evaluation of roads was at a level of 0%-30%. 42.1% of the respondents said that implementation monitoring and evaluation of roads was at a level of 40%-70% and 18.4% of the respondents said that implementation monitoring and evaluation of roads was at a level of 40%-70%. This indicated that the amount of resources that was allocated in Kisii County Government affected on monitoring and evaluation. Hence the findings indicated that budget allocation had an on monitoring and evaluation of county based projects. It was often difficult to enhance monitoring and evaluation majority of the respondents (42.1%) said that only 10% budget was allocated for implementation project monitoring and evaluation which affected negatively on monitoring and evaluation. Ramothamo, (2013) indicates that budget percentage allocation to monitoring and evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of data that takes place periodically needed to enhance decision making. Budget allocation is a way of improving project performance and pin points accountability of resources and work.

**Level of Implementation of Construction of Sub County Offices**

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the level of implementation of construction of sub county offices headquarters at Kisii County Government. 5.3% of the respondents said that monitoring and evaluation of construction of sub county offices headquarters was at a level of 0%-30%. 13.2% of the respondents said that implementation monitoring and evaluation of construction of sub county offices headquarters was at a level of 40%-70% and 81.6% of the respondents said that implementation monitoring and evaluation of construction of sub county offices headquarters was at a level of 70%-100%. These findings showed that much of the projects done on construction of sub county offices were almost complete.

**Level of Implementation of Market Shades**

The study sought to establish from the respondents on the level of implementation of market shades at Kisii County Government. 73.7% of the respondents said that monitoring and evaluation of market shades was at a level of 0%-30%. 21.1% of the respondents said that implementation monitoring and evaluation of construction of market shades was at a level of 40%-70% and 81.6% of the respondents said that implementation monitoring and evaluation of construction of market shades was at a level of 70%-100%. This showed that there was less work or no work of construction of market shades projects done by Kisii County Government.
Variable Associations

Correlation analysis assesses whether there exists a linear association between the variables. Correlation range between -1 and +1. If the correlation between the variables approaches +1, it means that there is a strong positive association and the variables move strongly in a straight line. If the correlation is approaching -1, the degree of negative association between the variables is also strong but negative. If the correlation is approaching zero, it means that there is no strong (weak) association between the variables. A statistically significant correlation is indicated by a probability value of less than 0.05. This means that the probability of obtaining such a correlation coefficient by chance is less than five times out of 100, so the result indicates the presence of a relationship.

The study used Pearson correlation coefficient to show how well the variables move together in a straight-line fashion and the results were as shown below:-

Table 1: Correlation Variable Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community involvement</th>
<th>Budgetary allocation</th>
<th>Skills of the project manager</th>
<th>Legal procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary allocation</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills of the project manager</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal procedures</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above showed the correlation between the variables. The correlation between budgetary allocation and community involvement was 0.2489. A correlation of 0.2489 implied that the two variables moved in the same direction and influence each other at 24.89%. Skills of the project manager and community involvement had a positive correlation of 0.2970, that is, when Skills of the project manager increases community involvement increases. The change occurs at 29.7%.

Skills of the project manager and budgetary allocation had a correlation of 0.079. This implied that the two variables influenced one another by 7.9% towards the same direction. Legal procedures correlated with community involvement at 0.118 which implied that an increase in one variable led to an increase in the other variable at the rate of 11.8% and the rate of 0.3484 with budget allocation. Legal procedures had no correlation with skill of the project manager since the correlation coefficient was at 0. A correlation coefficient 0 indicated there was no relationship between the variables, that is, one variable can remained constant while the other increased or decreased. These correlation rangeed between 0.297 and 0.348 hence indicating that the variables were not highly correlated hence multicollinearity.
**Hypothesis Testing**

To test the hypothesis, a multiple regression was used to determine how community involvement; budget allocation, skills of the project manager, legal procedures influence level of monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County. Multiple regressions illustrate how the independent of predictor variables influence a dependent variable. The research used statistical package for social sciences (SPSS V 21.0) to code, enter and compute the measurements of the multiple regressions. The null hypothesis is there is no statistically significant effect of factors on level of monitoring and evaluation.

**Model Formulation**

The model was as follows the dependent variable was the project sustainability

\[ Y = a + \beta_1X1 + \beta_2X2 + \beta_3X3 + \beta_4X4 \]

Where

- \( Y \) is the dependent or explained variable of level of monitoring and evaluation
- \( a \) = constant or the \( y \)-intercept
- \( \beta_1 \) is the rate at which changes in community involvement explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation
- \( \beta_2 \) is the rate at which changes in the Budgetary allocation explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation
- \( \beta_3 \) is the rate at which changes in skills of the project manager explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation
- \( \beta_4 \) is the rate at which changes in legal procedure explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation

\( \beta_3 \) is the rate at which changes in skills of the project manager explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation.

\( \beta_4 \) is the rate at which changes in legal procedure explains the changes in level of monitoring and evaluation.

\[ X_1 = \text{Community involvement} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{Budgetary allocation} \]
\[ X_3 = \text{Skills of the project manager} \]
\[ X_4 = \text{Legal procedures} \]

While \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \) and \( \beta_4 \) are coefficients of determination.

**Model Assumptions**

The model assumed a linear relationship between variables, a normal distribution of the variables and little or no multicollinearity of variables.

**Testing of the Model**

The coefficient of determination was carried out to measure how well the statistical model was likely to predict future outcomes. The coefficient of determination, \( r^2 \) is the square of the sample correlation coefficient between outcomes and predicted values. As such it explains the contribution of the three independent variables (community involvement; budget allocation, skills of the project manager, legal procedures) to the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County). This information is summarized on Table 4.12 for project managers and table.
Multi regression coefficients show a prediction ratio of 50%. This indicated that 49.8% of the variance in the dependent variable was predicted by the independent variable. This showed an average prediction rate.

**Analysis of Variance**

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical model that assesses potential variation among group means and their associated procedures. The study finding was analysed using analysis of variance to show the mean and f-test.

The results of analysis of variance for project managers response was summarized in table 3. To test the significant of the model, the study used ANOVA. The ANOVA table above described the overall variance accounted for in the model.

**Table 3: ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.838</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>32.640</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.478</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F statistics tests the null hypothesis that the expected values of the regression coefficients are equal to each other and that they equal zero. The F-score (F= 1.362) with a significance of 0.26. The higher the F-score the lower the significance and the lower the F-score the higher the significance. The table provides the effect of individual predictor variable on the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation). The results suggest that all independent variables i.e. community involvement, budget allocation, skills of the managers and legal procedures are very significant predictors of level of monitoring and evaluation as they all have a p value of less than 5% implying a more than 95% confidence level of the derived model. From table 3, the significance value was 0.26 which is greater than 0.05 thus the model was statistically insignificant in predicting how community involvement, budget allocation, skills of the managers and legal procedures influence level of monitoring and evaluation. This indicates that there are other variable that influence the independent variable which is not part of the covered variable.
Beta Coefficient

Beta coefficient guided us on determining of which of the independent variable have a greater effect on level of monitoring and evaluation. A beta coefficient was run to identify how community involvement, budget allocation, skills of the managers and legal procedures influence level of monitoring and evaluation as indicated in table 4.

Table 4: Beta Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocation</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills of the project manager</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal procedures</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 4 showed that community involvement had (beta = 0.195 and significance = 0.571). This indicates that a change of one standard deviation, holding other factors constant would change the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation) by 19.5%. Budget allocation had (beta = 0.432 and significance = 0.206), this indicates that a change of one standard deviation, holding other factors constant would change the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation) by 43.2%. A positive beta coefficient (0.432) means that the independent variable (budget allocation) is positively correlated with the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation). Skills of the project manager (beta = 0.206 and significance = 0.537, this indicates that a change of one standard deviation, holding other factors constant would change the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation) by 20.6%. Legal procedures had (beta = 0.159 and significance = 0.67), this indicates that a change of one standard deviation, holding other factors constant would change the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation) by 15.9%. A positive beta coefficient (0.159) means that the independent variable (legal procedures) is positively correlated with the dependent variable (level of monitoring and evaluation).

Hypothesis H01

The findings of the study showed that there was a significant effect of community involvement on level of implementation of monitoring as shown by a beta coefficient (β=0.006). This study therefore rejects the null hypothesis H01: There is no statistically significant effect of community involvement on level of implementation of monitoring in Kisii County. Community involvement therefore, contributes to level of implementation of monitoring in Kisii County.
Hypothesis \( H_{O2} \)

It was also found out that there was a significant effect of budget allocation on level of monitoring and evaluation as indicated by a beta-coefficient \((\beta=0.053)\). The study therefore rejects the null hypothesis \( H_{O2} \): There is no statistically significant effect of budget allocation on level of monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County. Therefore, budget allocation contributes to level of monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County.

Hypothesis \( H_{O3} \)

The findings also showed that there was a significant effect of skills of project manager on level of monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County as indicated by a beta-coefficient \((\beta=0.202)\). This study therefore rejects the null hypothesis \( H_{O3} \): There is no statistically significant effect of skills of project manager on level of monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County.

Hypothesis \( H_{O4} \)

The findings also showed that there was a significant effect of legal procedures on level of monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County as indicated by a beta-coefficient \((\beta=0.039)\). This study therefore rejects the null hypothesis \( H_{O4} \): There is no statistically significant effect of legal procedures on level of monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The findings further showed that the community was involved in the monitoring and evaluation in county government projects at Kisii County Government whereby respondents said that during the monitoring and evaluation the community is involved in the designing process was a strategy that was involvement of community on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects.

The study findings indicated that there were effects of budgetary allocation that enhanced on effective monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Kisii County Government whereby the respondents indicated that budgetary allocations for monitoring and evaluations were enough and that the amount allocated for monitoring and evaluation was adequate to enhance effective monitoring and evaluation in county government projects.

The study findings indicated that there was influence of skills of project manager on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects in Kisii County whereby majority of the respondents indicated that manager’s skills influenced on monitoring and evaluation in county government projects and that the project manager is trained on risk management which enhanced monitoring and evaluation in Kisii County Government.

The study findings indicated that there were effects of legal procedures that affected on monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County Government projects whereby the respondents said that the tendering procedures used in implementation of M & E projects are open to scrutiny and question by the public in the county and that the administration/leadership in Kisii county is abiding legal procedure on implementation of the monitoring and evaluation projects which enabled county government adhere to the project procedures to
enhance monitoring and evaluation at Kisii County Government projects.

Conclusion

Involvement of community members in monitoring and evaluation of projects in Kisii county was affected laws rules and regulation the governed the county in enhancing implementation of projects despite of the challenges of increased reliability in community participation, non-addressed legal issues among members of the society on matters concerning project monitoring and evaluation.

Kisii County had a definite proportion of the total budget of monitoring and evaluation which was between 5 to 10 percentages of the total budget. The monitoring and evaluation programme also indicates that, evaluation planning budget could certainly be more carefully estimated and actual expenditure on the evaluation more carefully monitored. Through Kisii-county should put measures in place to enhance affective policies for enhancing budgetary allocation on project monitoring and evaluation in the County.

The study concluded that project manager’s skills through leadership style that was applied enhanced supportive to legal procedure on monitoring and evaluation practices in Kisii county in that information was shared freely between the staff members of involved in projects implementation.

On legal procedures, the study concluded that Kisii-county had legal issues in place to enhance affective policies for enhancing strategic planning on project monitoring and evaluation in the County.

Recommendations of the Study

The Kisii county officers should allocate sufficient financial resources to enhance on monitoring and evaluation of projects implemented by county government through organizational policies and discipline to enhance the process through community involvement.

Proper rules, laws and regulation on budgetary allocation should formulated by the county governments in order to enhance people in rural areas in implementation of sustainable projects in Kisii county.

Proper infrastructure o enhancing skills to project managers should be established in Kisii County to be used on enhancing monitoring and evaluation of county government projects in Kisii County.

Competent project managers in legal procedures in Kisii County should be engaged in enhancing community awareness on legal matters concerning county government project to enhance effectiveness in monitoring and evaluation in order to avoid challenges that affect on better performance of such projects.

Suggestions for Further Study

Further study should be done on; Effects of government policies on capacity building through county government projects of a county.
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