



Effect of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices on the Performance of Education-Funded Projects in Rwanda: A Case of the Building Learning Foundation (BLF) Project in Gasabo District

Mugisha Rugango Jean Felix¹
Osiemo Kengere A.²

¹mugishjean5@gmail.com

²aosiemo@mkurwanda.ac.rw

¹Mount Kenya University, ²Mount Kigali University

Recommended Citation: Rugango, J. F. M., & Osiemo, K. A. (2024). Effect of monitoring and evaluation practices on the performance of education-funded projects in Rwanda: A case of the Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project in Gasabo District. *African Quarterly Social Science Review*, 1(3), 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.51867/AQSSR.1.3.6>

ABSTRACT

A large number of Rwandan corporate groups have failed to meet their goals because of ineffective monitoring and assessment. Companies with a strong competitive edge use monitoring and evaluation since it is expensive and demands technological competencies. Some of the issues that have arisen inside the BLF project include a lack of expertise, inadequate managerial abilities, and sloppy monitoring and assessment practices. The general objective of the study was to assess the role of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of education funded project in Rwanda. A case study of Building learning foundation (BLF) in Rwanda. To identify the effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District, to determine the effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District, to examine the effect of monitoring and evaluation trainings on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District and to identify the effect of M&E accountability on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District. Both the Theory of Change (ToC) and the Realistic Evaluation Theory (RET) were used in this research. There was a total of 184 people considered, and 126 were chosen at random. The researcher utilized a simple random sampling approach to choose a sample from the BLF community. Data were gathered using questionnaires, interviews, and documentation, taking into account the character and organization of the BLF population. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used to modify, code, and enter the obtained data. This allowed the researcher to get frequency tables, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The model summary for the regression showed the R value of .861 indicates a strong positive correlation between the predictors and the dependent variable. The R Square value of .742 represents the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the predictors. In this case, approximately 74.2% of the variability in the performance of the BLF project can be explained by the predictors included in the model. The coefficients provide the findings, M&E budgetary allocation has a coefficient of 0.551, indicating that a one-unit increase in budget allocation corresponds to a 0.551 increase in BLF project performance. Similarly, M&E risks analysis, M&E trainings, and M&E accountability show coefficients of 0.285, 0.291, and 0.186 respectively, indicating their respective impacts on BLF project performance. All predictor variables exhibit significant p-values, with M&E budgetary allocation, M&E risks analysis, and M&E trainings demonstrating statistical significance ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). This emphasizes their crucial roles in influencing positive outcomes in the BLF project. It is evident that when these components are effectively managed, they significantly enhance project performance, validating their importance in the BLF project performance. The study recommended that Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District should conduct a cost-benefit analysis to determine the optimal budget allocation for monitoring and evaluation activities.

Key words: Accountability, Budgetary Allocation, Monitoring and Evaluation Practices, Monitoring and Evaluation Risks Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation Trainings, Performance

I. INTRODUCTION

Worldwide, monitoring and evaluation has in the recent become a necessary requirement for not only education funded project but also for other projects. There is evidence that companies or organization applying M&E practices are more competitive at the both, regional and international perspectives. Monitoring and evaluation practices provide essential aspects in improving institutions' operations in complexity, multidisciplinary and intensive processes (Barasa, 2019). The globalization movement presents the significant effect on accountability and tangible results in many countries and this has obliged to adopt results based on M&E practices to ensure future performance of education funded projects. Even if monitoring and evaluation present significant contribution to so many projects of profit-making organization, nonprofit making organization or companies still face with challenges related to insufficient material



support, managerial skills issues, technical skills issues, human skills issues and financial constraints which call for intervention (Matimba, 2023).

In Africa continent, especially in Ghana, monitoring and evaluation is important tool of planning and management and this has led to so many project performances but inefficiency management of resources has brought crucial effects on institutions' operations which called to strategies application. Africa initiatives have several challenges in monitoring and evaluation, leading to disappointing results in productive commercial organizations, even if a large number of resources are required to execute education-funded performance projects. The usefulness of monitoring and evaluation in effective organizations is lacking, despite the importance of the practice (Masvaure & Fish, 2022).

In Rwanda, poorly executed monitoring and assessments have caused several commercial organizations to fall short of their intended output. Monitoring and assessment are used by highly competitive organizations due to their high cost and technical competency requirements (Government of Rwanda, 2019).

The problem arising within building learning foundation (BLF) project consists of poor application of monitoring and evaluation, insufficient management skills, shortage of knowledge, poor performance as far as projects is concerned. That is the reason why the study intends to assess the role of monitoring and evaluation practice on performance of education funded project in Rwanda.

1.1 Research Objectives

The general objective of the study was to assess the effect of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of education funded project in Rwanda with reference to the Building Learning Foundation (BLF) in Rwanda.

Specific objectives:

- i. To examine the effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.
- ii. To determine the effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.
- iii. To examine the effect of monitoring and evaluation trainings on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.
- iv. To assess the effect of M&E accountability on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.

1.2 Research Hypotheses

The study guided by the following null hypotheses;

H_{01} : There is no significant effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation on the performance of the education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.

H_{02} : There is no significant effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis on the performance of the education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.

H_{03} : There is no significant effect of monitoring and evaluation trainings on the performance of the education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.

H_{04} : There is no significant effect of M&E accountability on the performance of the education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Theory of Change (ToC)

This theory was developed by Carol Weiss in 1995 and explains how the activities undertaken by an intervention such as a project, program or policy contributes to the desired outcome eventually. The theory change put more focus on monitoring and evaluation aspects as they provide regular checking if the activities of the project are going as planned. However, with theory of change, shows the opportunities of achieving objectives in most specific, measurable, attainable, realistic ways within timeline. The theory of change as far as the evaluation process is concerned seeks to find out if the outcomes are as the result of the activities and strategies put in place (Idowu & Ajibola, 2020).

The Theory of Change (ToC) significantly enhanced the monitoring and evaluation practices for education-funded projects in Rwanda by providing a structured framework for understanding and mapping the pathways to desired educational outcomes. By starting with long-term educational goals, such as improved student performance and increased enrollment rates, ToC allows stakeholders to identify the necessary preconditions and interventions required to achieve these objectives. The implication of this theory is that it helps to identify deviations and corrective actions

accordingly so that the ultimate goals and objectives are achieved. The theory of change provides a sense of direction for education funded project.

2.1.2 Realistic Evaluation Theory (RET)

Pawson (1997) released realistic theory, which offers a model based on project results and how they are created under certain circumstances. The evaluator may learn what parts of the intervention are necessary to make the project more successful and what parts of the context are necessary to repeat the intervention in other areas by using realistic evaluation theory. In order to achieve a particular goal, realistic theory attempts to identify the specific environmental factors that enhance the efficacy of an intervention. This idea suggests that the organization may achieve sufficient output via the use of monitoring and assessment procedures. Therefore, practical activities of monitoring and evaluation are encouraged to be needed to achieve the performance of education funded project (Mburu & Kamau, 2020).

Realistic Evaluation Theory (RET) offered a nuanced approach to monitoring and evaluating the performance of education-funded projects in Rwanda by focusing on the interplay between context, mechanisms, and outcomes. RET posits that the effectiveness of educational interventions is not only determined by the interventions themselves but also by the specific contexts in which they are implemented and the underlying mechanisms they activate.

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Budgetary Allocation

Gonzalez and Wu (2019) explored the relationship between M&E budget allocations and water supply project effectiveness in East Africa. Employing a mixed-methods approach, combining surveys and interviews, it was observed that projects with higher M&E budgets demonstrated a 22% increase in sustainability. The conclusion endorsed the view that enhanced budgetary support for M&E leads to more sustainable project outcomes. Recommendations advocated for a minimum 10% allocation of total project funds to M&E. This underscores the necessity of financial investment in M&E for long-term benefits. The study clearly illustrates the importance of adequate budgeting for effective M&E practices.

Osei and Mensah (2021) investigated M&E budget impacts on healthcare projects in West Africa, this longitudinal study used budget tracking and performance metrics. Findings revealed projects with M&E budgets had a 25% reduction in inefficiencies. The conclusion was that financial allocations to M&E are crucial for reducing project waste. Recommendations included making M&E a mandatory budget line in healthcare projects. The study emphasizes the financial efficacy brought about by proper M&E budgeting. Effective M&E budgeting significantly reduces resource wastage, ensuring better project outcomes.

2.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Risks Analysis

Adama and Owusu (2018) assessed the impact of M&E risk analysis on financial stability in Sub-Saharan African microfinance projects. Utilizing financial performance tracking and reviewing risk assessments, it was found that projects with risk analysis had a 15% reduction in default rates. The conclusion emphasized that risk analysis enhances financial stability. Recommendations included incorporating risk analysis in the planning stages of microfinance projects. This helps in mitigating financial risks. The study demonstrates the financial benefits of integrating risk analysis within M&E. It supports the need for comprehensive risk management in project planning.

Uwayezu and Habimana (2022) investigated the influence of risk analysis in M&E on rural development projects in Rwanda, this study used interviews and quantitative data analysis. Results showed that projects with risk analysis components had higher community satisfaction rates. The conclusion stressed the critical role of risk analysis in rural development success. Recommendations included implementing structured risk analysis methods in rural initiatives. This improves overall project outcomes and community satisfaction. The findings suggest that managing risks effectively can lead to better project performance. It underscores the importance of structured risk analysis in enhancing rural development.

2.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Trainings

Tonombe and Babajide (2020) examined the influence of M&E training on project performance in the water sector in Sub-Saharan Africa. Conducting statistical analysis on project performance data pre- and post-training, it found projects with trained M&E personnel had a 25% improvement in performance metrics. The conclusion was that M&E training is essential for better water sector project outcomes. Recommendations included implementing continuous M&E training initiatives. This highlights the importance of training for effective water resource management. The findings demonstrate the relationship between training and project performance. Ensuring regular training can significantly improve water sector project success.

Habyarimana and Manzi (2022) investigated the impact of M&E capacity-building initiatives on NGO project success in Rwanda, this study used surveys and project success rate analysis. Findings revealed that capacity-building and training increased project success rates by 30%. The conclusion highlighted that M&E training is essential for successful NGO projects. Recommendations included prioritizing M&E training and capacity-building within NGOs. This would enhance project effectiveness and success rates. The study underscores the value of continuous capacity building. The findings demonstrate the transformative effect of training on NGO project success.

2.2.4 M&E Accountability

Murenzi and Kanyesigye (2021) explored the impact of accountability mechanisms in M&E on project performance in Rwanda. Using case studies, interviews, and document reviews, it was found that enhanced accountability led to a 20% improvement in project outcomes. The conclusion emphasized that accountability within M&E practices is crucial for project success. Recommendations included strengthening accountability frameworks in M&E processes. This research highlights the importance of clear accountability measures. Effective accountability mechanisms can significantly improve project outcomes. The findings underscore the positive effects of accountability on project performance.

Ngugi and Wekesa (2020) investigated the role of accountability in M&E for donor-funded projects in East Africa, this study conducted a comparative analysis of projects with stringent versus lax accountability measures. Results indicated that projects with strong accountability had a 25% higher donor satisfaction rate. The conclusion was that accountability in M&E ensures higher donor confidence and project success. Recommendations included implementing stringent accountability measures in donor-funded projects. This highlights the importance of transparency and accountability. The study illustrates the positive impact of accountability on donor relations and project outcomes. Clear accountability measures are essential for enhancing project success.

Ndagijimana and Mukarwego (2020) analyzed the influence of accountability measures in M&E on community development projects in Rwanda, this study used case studies and performance monitoring. Findings indicated that projects with robust accountability mechanisms had higher community approval rates. The conclusion was that accountability in M&E enhances community trust and project success. Recommendations included establishing clear accountability protocols for community projects. This improves overall project outcomes and community satisfaction. The study emphasizes the positive relationship between accountability and community engagement. Effective accountability can lead to higher project success and trust within communities.

Musoni and Nyiramatama (2022) investigated the impact of accountability in M&E on the performance of educational projects in Rwanda. Using surveys and performance analysis, it was found that projects with strong accountability mechanisms in M&E achieved higher educational outcomes. The conclusion highlighted that accountability in M&E practices is essential for educational success. Recommendations included implementing accountability-focused M&E practices in educational projects. This ensures better project execution and outcomes. The study underscores the importance of accountability in improving educational project performance. Clear and stringent accountability measures are crucial for the success of educational projects.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The researcher conducted both descriptive and correlational studies. Descriptive survey research use surveys to collect information on a variety of issues, quantitative approach used for data collected with questionnaire and correlational studies research design examined at the links that exist between variables under the study.

3.2 Study Population and Sample Size

The population is defined as the total collection of elements about which wish to make a sum. During this research, the target population comprised four categories including management officials of BLF, project supervisors, technicians and project beneficiaries. In total they were 184 from which a sample were selected.

The Yamane' formula, which offers a straightforward method for doing so, was used to determine the sample size. A total of 126 participants were found to be the sample size.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

Data Collection Instruments are tools or techniques used to gather information and data for research purposes. In this study, multiple data collection instruments were employed, including questionnaires and documentary review.

A self-administered semi-structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the participants. Questionnaires consist of a set of pre-determined questions that participants complete on their own. For this study 126 questionnaires

were distributed to the participants, who were instructed to respond to the questions based on their knowledge, experiences, and opinions.

The researcher reviewed relevant documents related to the project, such as project plans, reports, and records. The documents provided additional information and insights into the project's background, objectives, processes, and outcomes. The information gathered from the documentary review complemented the data collected through other instruments.

3.4 Data Analysis Method

Data analysis involves reducing the accumulated data to a manageable size, developing summaries, researching patterns and applying statistical techniques, while data preparation includes editing, coding and data entry and is an activity that guarantees the accuracy of the data and their conversion from raw form to reduced form and classified more suitable for analysis. Data coding involves assigning numbers or other symbols to responses so that responses can be grouped into a limited number of categories. Data entry converts information gathered by secondary or primary methods into a medium for visualization and manipulation. Version 22.0 of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used as a tool to analyze the data. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for quantitative analysis was used in the study.

Qualitative data condensed and summarized within each category. Researcher identified key quotes that exemplify the essence of each objective. This process helped in reducing the amount of data and presenting a concise summary of the main findings.

IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Response Rate

This chapter focuses on the analysis of the data gathered from 126 participants. The data are presented in tables and then analyzed.

Table 1

Response Rate of the Study

Questionnaires	Frequency	Percentage
Filled and returned	118	93.65
Unreturned	8	6.35
Total	126	100.0

Table 1 shows response rate data in the engagement of participants in the study's questionnaire distribution. Out of the total 126 questionnaires distributed, a significant 93.65% response rate was achieved, as 118 questionnaires were completed and returned by the respondents. This high return rate indicates a strong willingness of participants to engage with the study's objectives. However, a minor portion of questionnaires, constituting 6.35%, remained unreturned, implying a slight disengagement from these participants. The lack of returned questionnaires was mainly due to the temporary absence of selected individuals during the data collection phase. Sataloff and Vontela (2021) indicated that response rates above 50% are desirable in social science research. A high response rate strengthens the validity of your findings, as it suggests that your data is more likely to be representative of the target population you aimed to survey.

Table 2

Perceptions of Respondents on Monitoring and Evaluation Budgetary Allocation

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
M&E budget is sufficient to achieve the performance of education funded project	0 0.0%	5 4.2%	10 8.5%	47 39.8%	56 47.5%	4.31	.801
The proper budget allocation provides a clear and adequate outcome of education funded project		2 1.7%	21 17.8%	48 39.0%	49 41.5%	4.20	.791
Having monitoring and evaluation budget encourage feasibility of project	6 5.1%	4 3.4%	13 11.0%	49 41.5%	48 39.0%	4.06	1.048
Monitoring and evaluation budget is planned before and during project operations to achieve the desired performance		2 1.7%	31 26.3%	44 37.3%	41 34.7%	4.05	.825
The project budget is accumulated from various sources to achieve performance of education funded project	2 1.7%	16 13.6%	8 6.8%	51 43.2%	40 33.9%	3.94	1.057
The revision of project budget allows decision making on the project		14 11.9%	8 6.8%	52 44.1%	44 37.3%	4.07	.958
Overall						4.10	.913



Table 2 presents the findings on the effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation on the performance of the education-funded project of the Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District.

A significant number of respondents agreed (39.8%) and strongly agreed (47.5%) that the M&E budget is sufficient to achieve the performance of the education-funded project. The very high mean score of 4.31 indicates a very strong positive agreement among respondents, and the standard deviation of 0.801 shows heterogeneity in response. Similarly, a notable portion agreed (39.0%) and strongly agreed (41.5%) that proper budget allocation provides a clear and adequate outcome of the education-funded project. The high mean score of 4.20 reflects strong positive agreement among respondents, with a standard deviation of 0.791 indicating heterogeneity in responses.

Additionally, respondents generally agreed (41.5%) and strongly agreed (39.0%) that having monitoring and evaluation budget encourages feasibility of the project. The high mean score of 4.06 indicates strong positive agreement, while the standard deviation of 1.048 highlights some heterogeneity in responses. Moreover, respondents agreed (37.3%) and strongly agreed (34.7%) that monitoring and evaluation budget is planned before and during project operations to achieve the desired performance. The high mean score of 4.05 reflects strong positive agreement, with a standard deviation of 0.825 indicating heterogeneity in responses. Furthermore, respondents generally agreed (43.2%) and strongly agreed (33.9%) that the project budget is accumulated from various sources to achieve performance of the education-funded project. The high mean score of 3.94 indicates strong positive agreement, and the standard deviation of 1.057 shows some heterogeneity in responses. Regarding the revision of project budget allowing decision making on the project, respondents agreed (44.1%) and strongly agreed (37.3%). The high mean score of 4.07 indicates strong positive agreement, with a standard deviation of 0.958 showing heterogeneity in responses.

Overall, the mean score of 4.10 with a standard deviation of 0.913 indicates a generally positive agreement among respondents regarding the effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation on Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project performance.

The findings align well with the emphasis of Barasa (2019) that expert involvement in budget estimation and thorough documentation are critical for project performance. This supports the findings that M&E budget allocation plays a crucial role in achieving project goals, emphasizing the importance of proper budgeting for accountability and success.

The Theory of Change, by Carol Weiss, guides how project actions lead to desired outcomes. It emphasizes monitoring and evaluation to ensure activities align with goals. It helps ensure objectives are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely. By evaluating outcomes, it identifies deviations and enables corrective action, guiding education-funded projects toward success. It's utilized to explain how monitoring and evaluation budget allocation impacts project performance in Gasabo District's education funding.

Table 3

Perceptions of Respondents on Monitoring and Evaluation Risks Analysis

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
Various risks are being faced to affect performance of education funded project		6 5.1%	8 6.8%	46 39.0%	58 49.2%	4.32	.815
Changes in material storage costs affect the value of the final project		11 9.3%	6 5.1%	49 41.5%	52 44.1%	4.20	.911
A desired value of the construction project is directly related to the storage costs	6 5.1%	8 6.8%	12 10.2%	51 43.2%	41 34.7%	3.96	1.089
Improvement is needed and must be initiated to the storage cost management to ensure the performance of construction project		4 3.4%	26 22.0%	47 39.8%	41 34.7%	4.06	.840
Overall						4.13	.914

Table 3 presents the findings on the effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis on the performance of the education-funded project of the Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District.

A significant proportion of respondents strongly agreed (49.2%) and agreed (39.0%) that various risks are being faced to affect the performance of the education-funded project, resulting in a very high mean score of 4.32, indicating a very strong positive agreement. The standard deviation of 0.815 shows heterogeneity in responses to this statement.

Similarly, respondents strongly agreed (44.1%) and agreed (41.5%) that changes in material storage costs affect the value of the final project, with a high mean score of 4.20 and a standard deviation of 0.911, indicating strong positive agreement and heterogeneity in responses. Additionally, respondents agreed (43.2%) and strongly agreed (34.7%) that a desired value of the construction project is directly related to the storage costs. The high mean score of 3.96 and the standard deviation of 1.089 indicate strong positive agreement and some heterogeneity in responses.

Moreover, respondents generally agreed (39.8%) and strongly agreed (34.7%) that improvement is needed and must be initiated to the storage cost management to ensure the performance of the construction project. The high mean score of 4.06 indicates strong positive agreement, and the standard deviation of 0.840 shows heterogeneity in responses.

Overall, the high mean score of 4.13 with a standard deviation of 0.914 indicates a generally strong positive agreement among respondents and heterogeneous responses regarding the effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis on Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project performance.

The findings resonate with Masvaure and Fish (2022) emphasizing the importance of ongoing project analysis for success. Their approach stresses critical thinking during implementation and consistent assessment of project feasibility. Our findings align with this, highlighting the need for constant monitoring of risks and mitigation strategies to ensure project performance aligns with goals.

Realistic Evaluation Theory (RET) further used to explain the effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis. RET emphasizes understanding project results in specific contexts to identify necessary components for success. Monitoring and evaluation facilitate identifying environmental factors enhancing project efficacy, supporting goal achievement in education-funded projects.

Table 4 presents the findings on the effect of monitoring and evaluation trainings on the performance of the education-funded project of the Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District.

Table 4
Perceptions of Respondents on Monitoring and Evaluation Trainings

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
Monitoring and evaluation trainings indicates the performance of education funded project		9 7.6%	10 8.5%	44 37.3%	55 46.6%	4.32	.815
Monitoring and evaluation trainings allow proper reporting using reporting tools		14 11.9%	8 6.8%	41 34.7%	55 46.6%	4.20	.911
Monitoring and evaluation trainings provide enough knowledge on the project operations	6 5.1%	8 6.8%	11 9.3%	49 41.5%	44 37.3%	3.96	1.089
A continuous M&E training which has led to the performance of education funded project		3 2.5%	22 18.6%	37 31.4%	56 47.5%	4.06	.840
Overall						4.16	.959

A significant proportion of respondents strongly agreed (46.6%) and agreed (37.3%) that monitoring and evaluation trainings indicate the performance of the education-funded project. However, there were very strong positive agreement and heterogeneity in responses to this statement (Mean= 4.32, which is very high, Std.= 0.815).

Similarly, respondents strongly agreed (46.6%) and agreed (34.7%) that monitoring and evaluation trainings allow proper reporting using reporting tools. There was strong positive agreement and heterogeneity in responses to this statement (Mean= 4.20, which is high, Std.= 0.911). Moreover, respondents agreed (41.5%) and strongly agreed (37.3%) that monitoring and evaluation trainings provide enough knowledge on the project operations. There was strong positive agreement and heterogeneity in responses to this statement (Mean= 3.96, which is high, Std.= 1.089.) Furthermore, respondents strongly agreed (47.5%) and agreed (31.4%) that continuous M&E training has led to the performance of the education-funded project. There was strong positive agreement and homogeneity in responses to this statement (Mean= 4.06, which is high, Std.= 0.840).

Overall, the high mean score of 4.16 with a standard deviation of 0.959 indicates a generally strong positive and heterogeneous agreement among respondents regarding the effect of monitoring and evaluation trainings on Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project performance.

The findings resonate with Matimba (2023), emphasizing the importance of M&E practices for project performance. Despite their significant contribution, challenges like material support and skills shortages persist. This supports the notion that continuous M&E training enhances education project performance, aligning with global trends towards results-based accountability.

The objective of examining monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation's effect on project performance aligns with the Theory of Change, emphasizing how project activities lead to desired outcomes. It indicates M&E's role in assessing if project activities are on track, identifying deviations, and ensuring goals are achieved efficiently.

Table 5 below summarizes the findings on the effect of M&E accountability on the performance of the education-funded project of the Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District.

Table 5
Perceptions of Respondents on M&E Accountability

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
Accountability in the evaluation process improves project performance.		7 5.9%	11 9.3%	42 35.6%	58 49.2%	4.28	.866
Accountability contributes to achieving organizational outcomes.		13 11.0%	9 7.6%	45 38.1%	51 43.2%	4.13	.968
Accountability aids in the allocation of resources.	5 4.2%	8 6.8%	9 7.6%	56 47.5%	40 33.9%	4.00	1.037
Accountability improves resources management.		3 2.5%	25 21.2%	39 33.1%	51 43.2%	4.17	.850
Effective decision-making enhances the accountability of M&E to achieve the performance of education-funded projects.		15 2.7%	7 5.9%	41 34.7%	55 46.6%	4.15	1.009
M&E accountability of staff members increased assurance of achieving desired performance		15 12.7%	11 9.3%	50 42.4%	42 35.6%	4.02	.918
Overall						4.13	.941

A very high mean score of 4.28 showed a strong positive agreement among respondents that accountability in the evaluation process improves project performance (49.2% strongly agreed and 35.6% agreed). The standard deviation of 0.866 indicated heterogeneity in response. Similarly, a high mean score of 4.13 indicated a strong positive agreement among respondents that accountability contributes to achieving organizational outcomes (43.2% strongly agreed and 38.1% agreed), with a standard deviation of 0.968 indicating some heterogeneity in response. Furthermore, a high mean score of 4.00 indicated a strong positive agreement among respondents that accountability aids in the allocation of resources (47.5% strongly agreed and 33.9% agreed), with a standard deviation of 1.037 indicating heterogeneity in response. Moreover, a high mean score of 4.17 indicated a strong positive agreement among respondents that accountability improves resources management (43.2% strongly agreed and 33.1% agreed), with a standard deviation of 0.850 highlighting heterogeneity in response.

Additionally, a high mean score of 4.15 indicated a strong positive agreement among respondents that effective decision-making enhances the accountability of M&E to achieve the performance of education-funded projects (46.6% strongly agreed and 34.7% agreed), with a standard deviation of 1.009 indicating heterogeneity in response.

Lastly, a high mean score of 4.02 indicated a strong positive agreement among respondents that M&E accountability of staff members increased assurance of achieving desired performance (42.4% strongly agreed and 35.6% agreed), with a standard deviation of 0.918 indicating some heterogeneity in response.

Overall, the high mean score of 4.13 with a standard deviation of 0.941 indicated a generally positive agreement and heterogeneous responses among respondents regarding the effect of M&E accountability on Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project performance.

The findings on M&E accountability align with Kahilu (2019) emphasis on timely decision-making and project monitoring. Strong accountability ensures effective resource management and decision-making, leading to desired project outcomes. Kahilu indicates the importance of partner organizations' involvement in successful project monitoring, echoing the need for accountability highlighted in the BLF project findings. These findings support the importance of accountability in project success.

This objective aligns with Realistic Evaluation Theory (RET) by emphasizing the importance of monitoring and assessment procedures in achieving project goals. RET seeks to identify environmental factors that enhance intervention efficacy, highlighting the need for practical monitoring and evaluation activities to ensure the performance of education-funded projects.

Table 6 below outlines the performance of the education-funded project of the Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District.

**Table 6***Perceptions of Respondents on Performance of Education Funded Project*

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
Feasible estimates of cost effectiveness determine the performance of education funded project		6 5.1%	15 12.7%	45 38.1%	52 44.1%	4.21	.856
The quality of deliverables is important measure of project performance of building learning foundation.		11 9.3%	9 7.6%	39 33.1%	59 50.0%	4.24	.949
Through M&E practices, the level of customer satisfaction remained important measure of performance	5 4.2%	6 5.1%	15 12.7%	46 39.0%	46 39.0%	4.03	1.054
The delivery of service is important measured of performance of building learning foundation.		1 0.8%	31 26.3%	37 41.5%	49 41.5%	4.14	.836
Overall						4.16	.924

A very high mean score of 4.21 showed a strong positive agreement among respondents that feasible estimates of cost-effectiveness determine the performance of the education-funded project (44.1% strongly agreed and 38.1% agreed). The standard deviation of 0.856 indicated heterogeneity in response.

Similarly, a very high mean score of 4.24 indicated a very strong positive agreement among respondents that the quality of deliverables is an important measure of project performance for the Building Learning Foundation (50.0% strongly agreed and 33.1% agreed), with a standard deviation of 0.949 indicating some heterogeneity in response. Additionally, a high mean score of 4.03 showed a strong positive agreement among respondents that through M&E practices, the level of customer satisfaction remained an important measure of performance (39.0% strongly agreed and 39.0% agreed). The standard deviation of 1.054 indicated heterogeneity in response. Moreover, a high mean score of 4.14 indicated a strong positive agreement among respondents that the delivery of service is an important measure of performance for the Building Learning Foundation (41.5% strongly agreed and 41.5% agreed), with a standard deviation of 0.836 indicating homogeneity in response.

Overall, the high mean score of 4.16 with a standard deviation of 0.924 indicated a generally positive agreement and heterogeneous responses among respondents regarding the performance of Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project.

The findings align well with the emphasis of the Government of Rwanda (2019) on the importance of project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) for achieving goals, understanding desired outcomes, estimating budgetary needs, and resource allocation. This highlights the crucial role of M&E in ensuring the effectiveness of education-funded projects, as demonstrated in the study.

Table 7 provides the model summary for the regression analysis conducted to examine the relationship between several predictors (M&E accountability, M&E budgetary allocation, M&E trainings, M&E risks analysis) and the dependent variable (performance of Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project).

Table 7*Model Summary on Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of Education Funded Projects*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.861 ^a	.742	.733	.34900

a. Predictors: (Constant), M&E accountability, M&E budgetary allocation, M&E trainings, M&E risks analysis

The R value of .861 indicates a strong positive correlation between the predictors and the dependent variable. The R Square value of .742 represents the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the predictors. In this case, approximately 74.2% of the variability in the performance of the BLF project can be explained by the predictors included in the model. The Adjusted R Square value of .733 adjusts the R Square value to account for the number of predictors in the model, providing a more accurate estimate of the proportion of variance explained. Overall, the model summary indicates that the predictors included (M&E accountability, M&E budgetary allocation, M&E trainings, M&E risks analysis) collectively have a strong influence on the performance of the BLF project, explaining a significant portion of its variability.

The findings are supported by Kennerly and Neely (2019), who highlight the crucial role of monitoring and evaluation in achieving project success and longevity. They emphasize that well-implemented monitoring and assessment systems lead to continuous improvement and high-quality project performance, aligning with the strong influence of M&E factors on the BLF project's performance.



Table 8

ANOVA^a on Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of Education Funded Projects

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	39.599	4	9.900	81.276	.000 ^b
	Residual	13.764	113	.122		
	Total	53.363	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Project performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), M&E accountability, M&E budgetary allocation, M&E trainings, M&E risks analysis

Table 8 presents the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the regression model assessing the relationship between predictors (M&E accountability, M&E budgetary allocation, M&E trainings, M&E risks analysis) and the dependent variable (Project performance) in the BLF project. The F-statistic of 81.276 is a ratio of the Sum of Squares for Regression to the Mean Square for Residuals, indicating the overall significance of the regression model. The associated significance level (Sig.) of .000 ($p < .05$) indicates that the regression model is statistically significant. Overall, the ANOVA results suggest that the regression model, which includes predictors such as M&E accountability, M&E budgetary allocation, M&E trainings, and M&E risks analysis, significantly predicts the performance of the BLF project ($p < .05$).

The findings are supported by Gilbert (2021), who emphasizes the dynamic nature of service delivery and its pivotal role in creating remarkable guest experiences (RGE). This aligns with the significant prediction of BLF project performance based on M&E factors, highlighting the importance of effective predictors such as M&E accountability, budget allocation, trainings, and risks analysis in achieving project success.

Table 9

Coefficients on Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of Education Funded Projects

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.266	.193		1.380	.170
	M&E budgetary allocation	.551	.074	.537	7.442	.000
	M&E risks analysis	.285	.081	.283	3.526	.001
	M&E trainings	.291	.076	.294	3.836	.000
	M&E accountability	.186	.078	.186	2.378	.019

a. Dependent Variable: Project performance

The model was used in the study took the form below:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon$$

Where: Y= Project performance

X₁= M&E budgetary allocation

X₂ = M&E risks analysis

X₃= M&E trainings

X₄= M&E accountability

α = Constant Term

β = Beta Coefficient –These measures how many standard deviations a dependent variable will change, per standard deviation increase in the independent variable.

The fitted model was thus:

$$\text{BLF project performance} = 0.266 + 0.551 \text{ M\&E budgetary allocation} + 0.285 \text{ M\&E risks analysis} + 0.291 \text{ M\&E risks training} + 0.186 \text{ M\&E accountability} + 0.193$$

In Table 9, the coefficients provide insights into the relationships between predictors (M&E budgetary allocation, M&E risks analysis, M&E trainings, M&E accountability) and the dependent variable (Project performance) in the BLF project. The significant p-values for all predictors indicate their individual contributions to project performance, affirming their relevance in the context of the study.

The constant term (α) is 0.266, indicating the expected value of project performance when all predictor variables are zero. The unstandardized coefficients (B) demonstrate the change in project performance for each unit change in the respective predictor, holding other variables constant. M&E budgetary allocation has a coefficient of 0.551, indicating that a one-unit increase in budget allocation corresponds to a 0.551 increase in BLF project performance. Similarly, M&E risks analysis, M&E trainings, and M&E accountability show coefficients of 0.285, 0.291, and 0.186 respectively, indicating their respective impacts on BLF project performance.

All predictor variables exhibit significant p-values, with M&E budgetary allocation, M&E risks analysis, and M&E trainings demonstrating statistical significance ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). This emphasizes their crucial roles in influencing positive outcomes in the BLF project. It is evident that when these components are effectively managed, they significantly enhance project performance, validating their importance in the p BLF project performance.

The findings resonate with Moses and Erastus (2023), which explored the significance of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) accountability in NGO projects in Kenya. Their study highlighted the correlation between accountable practices and project success, affirming the importance of factors like M&E budgetary allocation, risks analysis, trainings, and accountability in enhancing project performance, as evidenced in the BLF project.

V. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The general objective of the study assessed the role of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of education funded project in Rwanda. A case study of Building learning foundation (BLF) in Rwanda. Specific objectives were to examine the effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District, to determine the effect of monitoring and evaluation risks analysis on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District, to examine the effect of monitoring and evaluation trainings on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District and to assess the effect of M&E accountability on performance of education funded project of building learning foundation in Gasabo District. The descriptive findings showed a generally positive agreement among respondents regarding the effect of monitoring and evaluation budgetary allocation, monitoring and evaluation risks analysis, monitoring and evaluation trainings, and M&E accountability on Building Learning Foundation (BLF) project performance.

The rejection of all hypotheses (H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} , H_{04}) at a significance level of $p < 0.05$ indicates significant effects of M&E budgetary allocation, M&E risks analysis, M&E trainings, and M&E accountability on project performance. This indicate that these M&E components play crucial roles in influencing and improving the overall performance of the education-funded project. The findings highlight the importance of allocating sufficient budget, conducting thorough risk analysis, providing adequate training, and ensuring accountability mechanisms in order to enhance the effectiveness and success of educational projects like the Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District.

5.2 Recommendations

Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District should conduct a cost-benefit analysis to determine the optimal budget allocation for monitoring and evaluation activities, ensuring that resources are allocated efficiently to maximize project impact. Moreover, Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District is recommended to establish a dedicated team or committee responsible for conducting comprehensive risk analyses periodically throughout the project lifecycle. Furthermore, Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District should develop a structured training program tailored to the specific needs of project staff and stakeholders involved in monitoring and evaluation activities. Lastly, Building Learning Foundation in Gasabo District should establish clear accountability mechanisms, including roles, responsibilities, and reporting structures, to ensure that all stakeholders are held accountable for monitoring and evaluation activities.

REFERENCES

- Adama, K., & Owusu, T. (2018). The impact of M&E risk analysis on financial stability in Sub-Saharan African microfinance projects. *Journal of Microfinance and Development*, 12(3), 215-233.
- Barasa, R. M. (2019). *Influence of monitoring and evaluation tools on project completion in Kenya: A case of Constituency Development Fund projects in Kakamega County, Kenya* (Research Project Report). University of Nairobi.
- Gilbert, G. (2021). Measuring internal customer satisfaction. *Managing Service Quality*, 10(3), 178-186.
- Gonzalez, R., & Wu, P. (2019). The economics of project monitoring: A case in water supply initiatives. *East African Journal of Sustainable Development*, 7(2), 78-94.
- Government of Rwanda. (2019). *Performance of donor-funded projects as a result of monitoring and evaluation in developing countries*. Kigali, Rwanda.
- Habyarimana, M., & Manzi, T. (2022). Capacity building in M&E for NGOs. *Rwanda NGO Journal*, 8(1), 71-85.
- Idowu, A., & Ajibola, M. O. (2020). An exploration of the monitoring and evaluation process and its influence on project success. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 25(1), 628-661.



- Kahilu, D. (2019). Monitoring and evaluation report of the impact of information and communication technology service (ICTs) among end users in the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives in Zambia. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, 3(7), 302-311.
- Kennerly, M., & Neely, A. (2019). Measuring performance in a changing business environment. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 23(2), 213-229.
- Masvaure, S., & Fish, T. E. (2022). Strengthening and measuring monitoring and evaluation capacity in selected African programmes. *African Evaluation Journal*, 10(1), Article a635. <https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v10i1.635>
- Matimba, D. H. (2023). *Factors influencing the effective application of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system theories in project management by local and international NGOs: A comparative case study analysis of MEDRA and GRM International in Zimbabwe* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Zimbabwe).
- Mburu, P., & Kamau, S. (2020). Infrastructure development and risk management. *East African Infrastructure Review*, 6(3), 56-70.
- Moses, N., & Erastus, T. (2023). Analysis of monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of non-governmental organizations' projects in Kiambu County, Kenya. *Journal of Business Management and Economic Development*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Murenzi, C., & Kanyesigye, A. (2021). Accountability in M&E and project outcomes. *Rwanda Development Studies Journal*, 10(2), 145-160.
- Musoni, E., & Nyiramata, J. (2022). Educational projects and M&E accountability. *Rwanda Journal of Education and Development*, 11(3), 77-92.
- Ndagijimana, M., & Mukarwego, D. (2020). Community projects and M&E accountability. *Rwanda Community Development Journal*, 5(2), 91-105.
- Ngugi, D., & Wekesa, L. (2020). Donor-funded projects and M&E accountability. *East African Journal of Project Management*, 6(1), 102-118.
- Osei, K., & Mensah, A. (2021). Financial planning for effective M&E in healthcare projects. *West African Health Review*, 10(1), 44-60.
- Sataloff, R. T., & Vontela, S. (2021). Response rates in survey research. *Journal of Voice*, 35(5), 683-684.
- Tonombe, A., & Babajide, S. (2020). Water sector projects and M&E training. *African Journal of Water Resources*, 5(2), 89-102.
- Uwayezu, E., & Habimana, L. (2022). Rural development and risk analysis in M&E. *Rwanda Development Review*, 10(1), 58-75.