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ABSTRACT
The introduction of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and structures is often linked to public service reform initiatives in budgeting and accountability. The aim of this study was to establish the role of monitoring and evaluation on performance of public organization projects in Kenya. The study adopted a descriptive survey and targeted 427 employees at Kenya Meat Commission Head Office. A sample of 81 respondents of the target population was considered by use of stratified sampling method. The primary data was collected through the use of questionnaires and secondary data was obtained from published documents to supplement the primary data. The variables namely human resource, implementation strategy, training and planning were regressed and study findings showed that all independent variables significantly and positively influenced performance of Kenya Meat commission projects. The study also recommends that human resource aspects such as staff entrusted with monitoring and evaluation should have technical skills, be dedicated to the function, roles and responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation personnel need to be specified at the start of projects. There is need to use participatory approaches during monitoring and evaluation of projects. The organization needs to have a computerized database for storage and analysis of software’s and data collection tools; have progress and results review platforms and reporting templates. Finally, planning on monitoring and evaluation of Kenya Meat Commission should be enhanced. The managers should be involved in the design, implementation and reporting on monitoring and evaluation and also when clarifying scope, purpose, intended use, audience and budget for evaluation.
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INTRODUCTION
Monitoring can be defined as the ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards achieving their goals and objectives while evaluation is a rigorous and independent assessment of either completed or ongoing activities to determine the extent to which they are achieving stated objectives and contributing to decision making (UNDP, 2009). Monitoring and evaluation is conducted for several purposes namely to learn what works and does not; to make informed decisions regarding programme operations and service delivery based on objective data; to ensure effective and efficient use of resources; to track progress of programmes; to assess extent the programme is having its desired impact; to create transparency and foster public trust; to understand support and meet donor needs; and to create institutional memory.

According to UNDP (2009), monitoring focuses on the implementation process and asks the key question how well is the program being implemented while evaluation analyses the implementation process. Evaluation measures how well program activities have met objectives, examines extent to which outcomes can be attributed to project objectives and describes quality and effectiveness of program by documenting impact on participants and community. Monitoring generates periodic reports throughout the program cycle, focuses on project outputs for monitoring progress and making appropriate
corrections, highlights areas for improvement for staff and tracks financial costs against budget (UNDP, 2009).

According to Kamunga (2000), State Corporations (SCs) have not been able to achieve their objectives due to mismanagement, bureaucracy, wastage, pilferage, incompetence and irresponsibility by directors and employees. Despite the government intervening to save the SCs by re-examining their objectives and targets, training employees, increasing their salary and benefits, the state corporations still did not improve on their performance (Kamunga, 2000).

Wholey (2010) states that evaluation is used in government to increase transparency, strengthen accountability, and improve performance, whereas performance management systems establish outcome-oriented goals and performance targets, monitor progress, stimulate performance improvements, and communicate results to higher policy levels and the public (Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer, 2010). The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) function particularly the role it plays on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya is the focus of this research.

The Kenya Meat Commission was established in 1950 by an Act of Parliament, Cap 363 of the Laws of Kenya, to purchase cattle and small stock, acquire, establish and operate abattoirs, meat works, cold storage concerns and refrigerating works. The Commission was mandated to slaughter cattle and small stock, process by-products, prepare hides and chill, freeze, can and store beef, mutton, poultry and other meat foods for export or for consumption within Kenya. Obsolescence of the factory’s machinery and equipment, mismanagement and the poor status of the buildings, made KMC to be closed down in 1992. Due to its contribution to the development of Livestock industry and alleviation of poverty especially in Arid and Semi-arid Areas, the government deemed it necessary to make arrangements for the reopening of KMC in 2006.

Statement of the Problem

According to Knight et al. (2011), governments spending on public services accounts range between 15-45 % of GDP which has a high impact on the economy. The Global Consultation on Agricultural Extension observed that monitoring and evaluation are important yet frequently neglected functions in most organizations (FAO, 1990).

Best practice requires that projects are monitored for control because stakeholders require transparency, accountability for resource use and its impact, worthy project performance and organisational learning which will assist in forthcoming projects. In June 2006, the Government of Kenya revived Kenya Meat Commission and allocated it finances so that it may be a profit generating entity and also economically sustainable but till date, it has to be allocated grants and loans annually to finance its operations. Government resources have been utilised to implement Kenya Meat Commission Projects. In the financial year 2007/2008, The Ministry for Livestock stated that Ksh 595 Million was misappropriated despite the government allocating Ksh 1.1 billion towards rehabilitation and operationalization of KMC. (Kenya National Assembly Official record Hansard, 2008). Further statistics indicate that in the Financial Year 2014/2015 The GoK invested Ksh 700 Million towards restructuring of Kenya Meat Commission so that it may continue operating (Government of Kenya, 2014).

Previous studies have identified institutional framework, training, stakeholder participation, budgetary allocation, politics, M&E tools, planning, lack of knowledge skilled staff amongst others as factors determining monitoring and evaluation projects around the globe (Musomba, 2013; Kimweli, 2009; Ramadhan, 2014; Muzinda, 2007; Ogomoditse, 2012; Afsah, 2007; Richardson, 2009; Indrakumar, 2011; Clear, 2009; Ogwen, 2012; Fazli, 2012). Most of these studies have focused on monitoring and evaluation globally. Therefore, the study sought to investigate the role of monitoring and evaluation on performance of Kenya Meat Commission.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study was to establish the role of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of public organisation projects in Kenya.

The specific objectives of the study were to:

i. Examine effect of human resources on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya
ii. Determine effect of implementation strategies on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya

iii. Examine the effect of training on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya

iv. Find out effects of planning on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya

Research Questions
The study sought to answer the following research questions:

i. Does human resource on monitoring and evaluation affect performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya?

ii. What is the effect of implementation strategies on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya?

iii. Does training affect on monitoring and evaluation affect performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya?

iv. What is the effect of planning on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya?

Literature Review
Theoretical Review
This section reviews theories related to the study. These theories include resource based theory, agency theory, equity theory and theory of change.

Resource based theory
Penrose is credited with establishing the foundations of resource-based view as a theory (Roos & Roos, 1997). Barney (1991) states that a firm is a collection of physical capital resources, human capital resources and organizational resources. The core premise of the resource-based view is that organizational resources and capabilities can vary significantly across firms, and that these differences can be stable (Hijzen, Görg & Hine, 2005). The theory focuses on the idea of costly-to-copy attributes of the firm as sources of business returns and the means to achieve superior performance and competitive advantage (Conner, 1991).

Chandler (1990) indicates that organizational capabilities emanates from lower management, middle and top management and that a firm can gain competitive advantage when its resources and capabilities are used properly. He further states that if these organization capabilities were carefully synchronized and assimilated it could achieve the economies of scale and scope needed to compete in national and international markets (Chandler, 1990).

Barney (1986) states that, “sustainable competitive advantage is derived from resources that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable (due to path-dependence, causal ambiguity, and social complexity), and no substitutable” (Barney, 1986). A resource-based view of the firm accepts that attributes related to past experiences, organizational culture and competences are critical for the success of the firm (Hamel & Prahalad, 1996). The above theory relates to human resource on performance of public organizations projects.

Agency Theory
Agency theory asserts that a key activity for boards is monitoring management on behalf of shareholders and that effective monitoring can improve firm performance by reducing agency costs (Amy & Thomas, 2003). Boyd (1990) states that the monitoring function of boards is also referred to as the control role (Boyd, 1990).

According to Amy & Thomas (2003), the monitoring function refers directly to the responsibility of directors to monitor managers on behalf of shareholders. The theoretical underpinning of the board's monitoring function is derived from agency theory, which describes the potential for conflicts of interest that arise from the separation of ownership and control in organizations. In agency theory terms, the owners are principals and the managers are agents and there is an agency loss which is the extent to which returns to the residual claimants, the owners, fall below what they would be if the principals, the owners, exercised direct control of the corporation (Jensen and Meckling, 1976).
Agency theorists see the primary function of boards is to act in the interest of shareholders (Bainbridge, 1993). Monitoring by the board is essential to ensure that it does not pursue its own interests at the expense of the shareholders and as such it should be held in high regard. Amy & Thomas (2003) contend that a director’s monitoring function is to monitor the CEO, monitor strategy implementation, planning CEO successor and evaluating and rewarding the top managers.

**Equity Theory**

Adams’ Equity Theory was developed by John Stacey Adams in 1963 (Adams, 1963). The theory calls for a fair balance to be struck between an employee's inputs such as effort, loyalty, hard work, commitment, skill level, ability, adaptability, flexibility, tolerance, determination, enthusiasm and an employee's outputs such as training, salary, benefits, recognition, travel and development. According to the theory, finding this fair balance serves to ensure a strong and productive relationship is achieved with the employee, with the overall result being contented, motivated employees (Adams, 1963). If an employee feels that their input at the work place is not equal at the work place absenteeism will creep in and they perform below par (Greenberg, 1999).

Training is essential in improving performance of employees as well as supporting them; it also helps in identifying their competencies so that they can perform a task and evaluating how they perform. (Wagonhurst, 2002; Ridha, 1998). According to Nyerere (2009) failure to invest in skill training by Kenyan institutions results in understaffing which leads to poor quality education that is not synchronised with the requirements of the labour market or local livelihoods (Nyerere, 2009). According to Susan (2013), “relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact measures, could be used to measure evaluation of the training programmes. This could possibly be done through designing a logical framework that shows the activities, predictable outputs, M&E tasks, verification measures, the action centres, resource requirements and the time-frame” (Susan, 2013). This theory emphasizes the significance of the relationship between training of employees with performance at the work place. Specifically, managers should understand the success of the projects can be influenced greatly by training employees on monitoring and evaluation.

**Theory of Change (ToC)**

A theory of change is a model that explains how an intervention is expected to lead to intended or observed impacts (Burt, 2012). According to Jean, Diana & Avan, “A theory of change is utilised in strategic planning by management and decision making as a project or programme develops and progresses. It can also reveal what should be evaluated, and when and how, so that project and programme managers can use feedback to adjust what they do and how they do it to achieve the best results. A theory of change methodology will also help to identify the way people, organisations and situations change as a result of an organisation’s activities or services, helping to develop models of good practice” (Jean, Diana, & Avan, 2011).

According to Woodcock (2011), “some projects may, of their nature, yield high initial impacts while others may inherently take far longer, even decades, to show results, not because they ‘don’t work’ after three years, but because it’s simply how long it takes” (Woodcock, 2011). Burt (2012) further states that the theory of change is useful during implementation as it can check on quality and thus help programme team distinguish between implementation failure and theory failure. Burt further contends that it is essential to involve key stakeholder and staff in the development of the theory of social change as it will create a sense of ownership.

In planning, Annie (2009) states that the theory of change can help an organisation achieve a variety of results which are instrumental in its growth namely; strengthened organisational capacity through skills, staffing and leadership; strengthened alliances through level of coordination, collaboration and mission alignment; strengthened base of support through the grassroots, leadership and institutional relationships and alliances; improved policy through stages of policy change in the public policy arena, including adoption, implementation and funding; shift in social norms through the knowledge, attitude, values and behaviours; changes in impact through the ultimate changes in social and physical lives and conditions. Impact is affected not just by policy change, but by other strategies, such as community support and changes to behaviours (Annie, 2009).
Conceptual Framework
According to Orodho (2009) a conceptual framework describes the relationship between the research variables. Jabareen (2008) argues that a variable is a measurable characteristic that assumes different values among subjects. This study seeks to establish the role of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya. The independent variables in this study included human resource, implementation strategy, training and planning. On the other hand, the dependent variable was the performance of Public Organization Projects.

Independent Variables Dependent variable

- **Human Resource**
  - Human resource planning
  - Acquiring project team
  - Managing project team

- **Implementation Strategy**
  - Approaches
  - Framework
  - Methods of data collection

- **Training**
  - Skills
  - Levels
  - Managers

- **Planning**
  - Execution
  - Tools and techniques
  - Coordination

![Conceptual framework](image)

Fig. 1: Conceptual framework

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Research Design**
The research study adopted a descriptive survey design. Descriptive research design is chosen because it enables the researcher to generalize the findings to a larger population. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) the purpose of descriptive research is to determine and report the way things are and it helps in establishing the current status of the population.

**Target Population**
Data available from the Kenya Meat Commission records reveals there are 427 employees at the organization. The target population was 427 employees which was divided into three categories of the organization namely, managers, supervisors and the subordinate staff. The population was grouped into different categories called stratum on the basis of divisions (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). The sampling frame used was the human resource register at Kenya Meat Commission.
Table 1: Population and Sample size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Population(N)*</th>
<th>Sample size(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate staff</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Kenya Meat Commission, 2015

Owing to practical difficulties with responses from large survey groups, a meaningful survey sample size had to be determined. An appropriate sample size was calculated. A representative sample size with known confidence and risk levels was selected, based on the work of Yamane (1967) formula. An appropriate response rate (sample size) was determined. The formula used by Yamane (1967) is illustrated in as shown below;

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

Where \( n \) = sample size; \( N \) = Target population; \( e \) = Proportion of the study. There were 427 staff working at Kenya Meat Commission. Therefore, the targeted population of the study (\( N = 427 \)). A 95% confidence level is deemed acceptable and thus statistically \( z = 2 \). Placing information in the above formula at a 95% confidence level and an error limit of 10% results in:

\[
n = \frac{427}{1 + 427 (0.10)^2} = 81\text{ respondents}
\]

Eighty-one respondents would therefore be the lowest acceptable number of responses to maintain a 95% confidence level and a 10% error level. Therefore, a proportionate sample size of approximate 81 respondents which is 10% precision of the population was selected using a stratified random sampling technique from the identified study population.

Data Collection

The primary data was collected from employees of Kenya Meat Commission Head Office, using questionnaires because questionnaires are the most commonly used methods when respondents can be reached and are willing to co-operate. Structured questionnaires were used in this study to collect data. These methods can reach a large number of subjects who are able to read and write independently. A Likert Scale 1-5 was utilised to vary the strength of the responses. Cooper & Schindler, (2011) observed that, the questionnaire design defines the problem and the specific study objectives. The questionnaires will comprise closed ended questions.

A pilot study was undertaken on at least 8 respondents to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The rule of thumb is that 1% of the sample should constitute the pilot test (Creswell, 2003). The researcher used the most common internal consistency measure known as Cronbach’s alpha(\( \alpha \)). It indicates the extent to which a set of test items can be treated as measuring a single latent variable (Cronbach, 1951). The recommended value of 0.7 was used as a cut-off of reliabilities.

Data Analysis

To ensure easy analysis, the questionnaire was coded according to each variable of the study to ensure accuracy during analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed by employing descriptive statistics and inferential analysis using statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 21 and excel. A scale of 1-5 was used. The scores “Strongly disagree” and “Disagree” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 1 to 2.5 on the continuous Likert scale (1 ≤ Disagree ≤ 2.5). The scores of ‘Neutral’ were represented by a score equivalent to 2.6 to 3.5 on the Likert scale (2.6 ≤ Neutral ≤ 3.5). The score of “Agree” and
“Strongly agree” were represented by a mean score equivalent to 3.6 to 5.0 on the Likert Scale (3.6 ≤ Agree ≤ 5.0). The results were presented in mean and standard deviation. The mean was generated from SPSS version 21.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to measure statistically the significance in predicting how human resource, training, implementation strategy and planning influence performance of public organization projects in Kenya. The test of significance involved the use of squared moment correlation coefficient, the R square, as a measure of significance. The coefficient is a standard measure of an assumed linear relationship between variables. A coefficient of value between (+ve) 0.5 and (-ve) 0.5 or higher indicates a strong relationship and by extension a significant variable in influencing the trend of the dependent variable.

Further, a multiple regression analysis was used to establish the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables. The relationship among the variables is depicted as the equation for performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya as expressed in the following equation:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon, \]

where, \( Y = \) Performance of Public Organization Projects, \( \beta_0 = \) constant (coefficient of intercept), \( X_1 = \) human resource; \( X_2 = \) implementation strategy; \( X_3 = \) training; \( X_4 = \) planning; \( \epsilon = \) error term; \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_4 = \) regression coefficient of four variables.

**Data Presentation**

The findings will also be presented using tables, charts and graphs for further analysis and to facilitate comparison. This will generate quantitative reports through tabulations, percentages, and measure of central tendency. Descriptive statistics such as measures of central tendency and dispersion along with percentages will be used to organize and summarize numerical data whose results are presented in tables, pie charts, column and bar graphs for easy interpretation of the findings (Zhang, 2000).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Human Resource**

Table 2: Elements relating to human resource on monitoring and evaluation on performance of Kenya meat Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff are not entrusted with monitoring and evaluation have technical expertise in the area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff working on monitoring and evaluation are not dedicated to the function</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation personnel have been not been specified at the start of the project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed with the statements relating to human resource, and is as illustrated in Table 2. From the research findings, majority of the employees agreed that; Staff entrusted with monitoring and evaluation have technical expertise in the area as shown by a mean of 4.10, Staff working on monitoring and evaluation are dedicated to the function as shown by a mean of 3.95, Roles and responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation personnel have been specified at the start of the project as shown by a mean of 4.25. The findings of this study are in agreement with literature review by Wagonhurst (2002) who observed that human resource plays a key role in development of projects in an organization.
Implementation Strategies

When carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission looks at the time period and project components covered by the evaluation as shown by a mean of 4.10; When carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission looks at other existing or planned interventions of the same project as shown by a mean of 3.95; When carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission focuses on the target group as shown by a mean of 4.01 (Table 3). The findings of the study are in agreement with literature review by Julia & Helen (2011) who observed that effective results of productivity and performance for any organization depends on the laid implementation strategies as they positively influence performance of the projects thus the overall organization in the long run.

Table 3: Elements relating to implementation strategies on employee performance of Kenya Meat Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission does not look at the time period and project components covered by the evaluation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission does not look at other existing or planned interventions of the same project</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission does not focus on the target group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Adequacy of facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no computerised database for storage and analysis of softwares</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no data collection tools</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are few field visits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No skilled personnel on M and E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no progress and results review platforms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reporting templates</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed with the statements relating to adequacy of facilities for monitoring & Evaluation available at Kenya Meat Commission for Monitoring and Evaluation. A scale of 1-5 was used. The results are as shown in Table 4. From the study results, majority of respondents agreed that Computerized database for storage and analysis of soft wares with a mean of 4.10; data collection tools as shown by mean of 3.95; skilled personnel with a mean of 3.95;
Progress and results review platforms as shown with a mean of 4.10 and reporting templates as shown with a mean of 3.95.

The study sought to investigate approaches used at Kenya Meat Commission when carrying out Monitoring and Evaluation of projects. From the research findings, majority of the respondents as shown in Figure 2 illustrates that 35% were of the opinion that they used both approaches, 30% indicated that they used traditional approaches, 25% indicated participatory approaches and 10% stated they don’t use any of the mentioned approaches during monitoring and evaluation of projects at Kenya Meat Commission. This implies that approach affects performance of projects at Kenya Meat Commission.

![Figure 2: Approaches used for M&E on projects of Kenya Meat Commission](image)

Training

Table 5: Elements relating to M & E on performance of projects of KMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training needs are not regularly assessed at Kenya Meat Commission with</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regard to monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training conducted is usually not evaluated to permit revision of programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Meat Commission program does not use resources in the most economical</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner to achieve its objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed with the statements relating to training on M & E on performance of projects of Kenya Meat Commission. A scale of 1-5 was used. The results were presented in mean and standard deviation as shown in Table 5.

From the research findings, majority of the employees agreed that; Training needs are regularly assessed at Kenya Meat Commission with regard to monitoring and evaluation as shown by a mean of 4.01; Training conducted is usually evaluated to permit revision of programs as shown by a mean of 3.95, Kenya Meat Commission program uses resources in the most economical manner to achieve its objectives as shown by a mean of 4.10. The findings of the study corroborates with literature review by Yusuff &...
Saffu who states that for better performance of organization projects, the element of training is indispensable especially for the staff by developing training programs tailored for their performance in an organization.

Planning
The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed with the statements relating to planning at Kenya Meat Commission for Monitoring and Evaluation. A scale of 1-5 was used and results are presented in Table 6.

From the research findings, majority of the employees agreed that: The managers are involved in the design, implementation and reporting on monitoring and evaluation as shown by a mean of 3.95; The managers are involved when clarifying scope, purpose, intended use, audience and budget for evaluation as shown by a mean of 3.95, The managers are involved in knowledge dissemination of lessons learnt as shown by a mean of 4.10. The study results are in agreement with literature review by Yusuf & Saffu (2009) who states that planning plays a key role on monitoring and evaluation thus affecting performance of government funded projects.

Table 6: Elements relating to planning on monitoring and evaluation on performance of projects of Kenya Meat Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The managers are not involved in the design, implementation and reporting on monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The managers are not involved when clarifying scope, purpose, intended use, audience and budget for evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The managers are not involved in knowledge dissemination of lessons learnt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of projects of KMC
The study sought to investigate performance of projects of Kenya Meat Commission. From the research findings, majority of the respondents as shown in Figure 4.7 by 10% indicated that performance of projects was excellent, 25% stated it was good, 10% were of the opinion that it was fair whereas 45% the respondents were of the opinion that it was very poor and 10% were of the opinion that it was poor. This implies that performance of projects of Kenya Meat commission was very poor.
Regression Analysis
From the findings in Table 7 the value of adjusted r squared was 0.566 an indication that there was variation of 56.6 percentage on performance of projects of KMC due to changes in human resource, implementation strategies, training and planning at 95 percent confidence interval. This shows that 56.6 percent changes in performance of projects of KMC could be accounted to human resource, implementation strategies, training and planning. R is the correlation coefficient which shows the relationship between the study variables and from the findings shown in the Table 7 is notable that there exists strong positive relationship between the study variables as shown by 0.779. Additionally, this therefore means that factors not studied in this research contribute 43.40% of performance of projects of KMC and a further research should be conducted to investigate the other factors (43.40%) that affect performance of projects of KMC.

Table 7: Model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Variance
From the ANOVA statics Table 8, the study established the regression model had a significance level of 0.3% which is an indication that the data was ideal for making a conclusion on the population parameters as the value of significance (p-value) was less than 5%. The calculated value was greater than the critical value(51.000 > 8.3997) an indication that human resource, implementation strategies, training and planning all affects performance of projects of KMC. The significance value was less than 0.05 indicating that the model was significant.

Table 8: Analysis of Variancea

<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>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>105.653</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.41325</td>
<td>51.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.5179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.835</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of projects of KMC
b. Predictors: (Constant), Human resource, Implementation strategies, Training and Planning
c. Critical value =8.3997
Regression Coefficients

Table 9: Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>14.654</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategies</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding revealed that holding independent variables constant (Human resource, Implementation strategies, Training and Planning) to a constant zero, Performance of projects of KMC would be at 14.654, a unit increase in Human resource would lead to increase in Performance of projects of KMC by a factor of 0.747, a unit increase in Implementation strategies would lead to increase Performance of projects of KMC by factor of 0.831, a unit increase in Training would lead to increase in Performance of projects of KMC by a factor of 0.789 and unit increase in Planning would lead to increase in Performance of projects of KMC by a factor of 0.701. The study established that regression equation would be \( Y = 14.654 + 0.747X_1 + 0.831X_2 + 0.789X_3 + 0.701X_4 \).

Therefore, Performance of projects of KMC = 14.654 + (0.747 x Human Resource) + (0.831 x Implementation strategies) + (0.789 x Training) + (0.701 x Planning). From the results of this study in Table 9, Implementation strategies contributed more to the Performance of projects of KMC. At 5% level of significance, Human Resource had a p-value of 0.004; Implementation strategies had a p-value of 0.000; Training had a p-value of 0.000; planning had a p-value of 0.002. Therefore, the most significant factor was Implementation strategies. The findings of this study corroborates with literature review Julia & Haelen (2011) who observed that human resource, training, planning positively influence performance of the projects. Yumi a & Susan (2007) concluded that for better performance of public projects it is important that organizations plan to have effective implementation strategies for better results of the implemented projects.

**CONCLUSION**

The aspects of human resource on monitoring and evaluation contributed a lot to performance of KMC projects such as staff entrusted with monitoring and evaluation had no technical skills, staff working on monitoring and evaluation are not dedicated to the function, roles and responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation personnel had not been specified at the start of the projects. The human resource was statistically significant thus showed that it affected performance of KMC projects. Additionally, implementation strategies on monitoring and evaluation affected performance of Kenya Meat Commission projects. The study also showed that when carrying out evaluation Kenya Meat Commission does not look at the time period and project components covered; does not look at other existing or planned interventions of the same project and when carrying out evaluation and the organization rarely focuses on the target group.

Further, from the study results, it was established that there was lack of computerized database for storage and analysis of software’s and data collection tools; no skilled personnel and progress and results review platforms and reporting templates. KMC used both traditional and participatory approaches during monitoring and evaluation of projects. The implementation strategies showed that it was statistically significant which implied KMC projects were affected by implementation strategies applied by the organization.
Further the study established that training affected performance of projects of Kenya Meat Commission. According to the findings of the study, training needs are not regularly assessed at Kenya Meat Commission with regard to monitoring and evaluation; training conducted is usually not evaluated to permit revision of others and the organization does not use resources in the most economical manner to achieve project objectives. Training showed that it statistically significant. This implies that training significantly affected performance of Kenya Meat Commission projects.

Finally, planning on monitoring and evaluation affects performance of projects of Kenya Meat Commission. The managers were not involved in the design, implementation and reporting on monitoring and evaluation and when clarifying scope, purpose, intended use, audience and budget for evaluation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study recommends that human resource aspects such as staff entrusted with monitoring and evaluation should have technical skills, staff working on monitoring and evaluation should be dedicated to the function, roles and responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation personnel need to be specified at the start of the projects. Additionally, there is need to have clear implementation strategies on monitoring and evaluation on Kenya Meat Commission projects. The study recommends that when carrying out evaluation of Kenya Meat Commission projects, there is need to look at the time period and project components covered; looks at other existing or planned interventions of the same project and focus on the target group.

Further, the organization need to have a computerized database for storage and analysis of software’s and data collection tools; have skilled personnel and progress and results review platforms and reporting templates. The study recommends for use of participatory approaches during monitoring and evaluation of projects. The study also recommends that training needs should be regularly assessed for the organization projects with regard to monitoring and evaluation.

Finally, planning on monitoring and evaluation Kenya Meat Commission should be enhanced. The managers should be involved in the design, implementation and reporting on monitoring and evaluation and when clarifying scope, purpose, intended use, audience and budget for evaluation.
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