

## MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICES AND YOUTH PROJECT PERFORMANCE A CASE OF DIGITAL MENTAL HEALTH PROJECT FUNDED BY UNDP RWANDA

Rene NDAYAMBAJE<sup>1</sup>,

Dr. Joseph TINDYEBWA<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Business Management, Mount Kenya University,  
Kigali, Rwanda

<sup>2</sup> Master of Business Administration, Project Management Option

### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices and youth project performance in Rwanda with the particular goals: to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation planning on performance of Digital Health project as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda; to determine the influence of communication in monitoring on performance of Digital Health project as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda; to evaluate the influence of resource allocation in monitoring and evaluation on performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda; to establish the influence of resources allocation for monitoring and evaluation on performance of Digital Health project as one of the Youth Project Rwanda. It could be a subjective examination that includes cautious perception of a situation. The analyst utilized surveys to gather information, as distant as this study is concerned, the population was comprised of people, staff management and partners of digital mental health funded by UNDP Rwanda focusing on 180 workers. In this way, sample sizes of 180 individuals were considered to answer formulated questions. Universal sampling, as all population was questioned. The sample was made by number the staff management, stakeholders and employees of digital mental health funded by UNDP Rwanda respondents who was involved in interaction with researcher. Research was adopt the questionnaire for collecting primary data and documentation review to collect secondary data. Pilot study was performed to ensure the validity and reliability of data collection instrument. The data was analyzed trough Statistical Package for Social Sciences to percentage, mean and standard

deviation. The statement evaluated was "It brings satisfaction of beneficiaries for getting the services for long time on the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda" this was measured by a mean of 3.90 and standard deviation of 1.104. This indicated that the respondents are strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement". A very limited number of them participate in a few of the M&E activities, they do not do self-evaluations nor monitor how the project is being implemented so that they can suggest possible ways to make it more effective. Because they participate in M&E only to a very small extent, they cannot therefore know how to handle the project's activities should the intervention cease. The Pearson correlation also shows that even though PM&E has an impact on project sustainability, the impact is not high because PM&E is low as well as the respondents' perceptions on the indicators for project sustainability. The research findings suggest that implementing these strategies and conducting PM&E in Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda and also increasing the number of trainings to the primary beneficiaries, should contribute to increase its performance. Project implementers should involve policy makers at an early stage in the project if policy support is likely to be required to achieve project objectives. This is particularly important when attempting to improve its performance.

**Keywords:** Monitoring and evaluation practices and youth project performance.

## Introduction

the project/programme is ongoing (ADA, 2016). Evaluation is the periodic, retrospective assessment of an organization, project or programme that might be conducted internally or by external independent evaluators (ADA, 2016). Monitoring usually focuses on processes, such as when and where activities occur, who delivers them and how many people or entities they reach. Evaluation is the systematic assessment of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institution's performance. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is used to assess the performance of projects, institutions and programmes set up by governments, international organizations and NGOs. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact (Diabre, 2019).

Several other researchers also gave their views on the essentials of monitoring and evaluation; Monsalve, (2014) is another scholar who gave his contribution towards the rationale of monitoring and evaluation tools in project management effectiveness. When development projects are effectively managed, the impact is evident to the beneficiaries. He asserts and said that monitoring and evaluation are fundamental aspects of good programme management at all levels, be it national, regional and local. Monitoring and evaluation provides data on programme progress and effectiveness; it improves programme management and decision making for youth project performance; it allows accountability to stakeholders including funders; provides data for planning future resource needs and also it provides data useful for policy making and advocacy (Dominique & Ingrid, 2015).

Diabre (2019) in the Handbook of Monitoring and Evaluation for Results contends that the growing demand for development effectiveness is largely based on the realization that producing good deliverables is not enough. Efficient or well managed projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no noticeable improvement in development conditions and ultimately in peoples' lives. The United Nations Development Programme is therefore increasing its focus on results and how it better contributes to them. The essence of this, therefore, is that, for any development project to be useful for a long time and have a positive change on the way of living of the beneficiaries it should increase its focus on results and the contribution should be visible from planning, monitoring and evaluation (Diabre, 2019).

The rationale of monitoring and evaluation towards project success were also defended by Chinnanon (2017) where he asserts that monitoring and evaluation can be an effective tool to enhance the quality of the project planning and management. It was noted that monitoring helps project managers and staff to understand whether the projects are progressing on schedule and to ensure that project inputs, activities, outputs, and the life of project in general. Therefore, monitoring and evaluation is a tool to help planners and managers to identifying youth project performance (Gyorkos, 2016).

Worldwide, some countries began to show concepts of monitoring & evaluation and programmes in the late 1970s and early 1980s after lack of monitoring & evaluation was identified as a reason for the failure of many government projects for its sustainability (World Bank, 2018). Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) should be an integral part of any sustainability of a project; sometimes it is brought into development planning as a contingent element. This is not supposed to be so. According to Ika et al, (2016) project monitoring and evaluation is even more critical than planning in achieving project success and surviving for long. They reiterated that project monitoring and evaluation ranks highly as one of the major project success factors.

The Canadian Developed agencies have only recently recognized the need for monitoring & evaluation for sustainability of government projects. Proponents of Project Monitoring & Evaluation argue that it is more cost-effective, accurate and sustainable than conventional approaches. Monitoring & Evaluation in decision-making processes can also motivate people who want to see those decisions implemented effectively (Gyorkos, 2017). Another motivation for monitoring & evaluation is to strengthen government projects as well. Traditionally, evaluation tended to be managed with an outsider perspective, often giving little recognition to local expectations and the potential for stakeholder contributions. In effect, stakeholders were the objects of evaluations rather than key participants. Beneficiaries, local organizations and governments in recipient countries were left without substantive roles (Canadian International Development Agency, 2016).

Some African countries especially in Nigeria and South Africa are using them in terms of political circles to mean people being involved in political and project decisions, for others it is people having reasonable control over decisions of the organization they belong. For development economists Project Monitoring & Evaluation refers to the poor equitably sharing project benefits. Still others consider monitoring & evaluation to be an instrument to enhance project efficiency and youth project performance. Some would regard monitoring & evaluation as an end, whereas others see it as a means to an end (Mulwa, 2017).

Monitoring & evaluation can occur at any stage in the project cycle as (Stiglitz, 2018) highlighted: firstly in planning; secondly in project design; and thirdly through mobilization of local resources as an important ingredient of the initiative. Put differently, there are chances for monitoring & evaluation in the entire project cycle; needs analysis, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. In fact, participation ought to involve people throughout the project cycle; in implementation, having a share of development benefits and evaluating project outcomes. The stakeholders also are in a position to define goals and project preparation. Despite contention among authors on the benefits of participation, the rationale of stakeholder participation is evident in several case studies (Mulwa, 2017).

Kenya monitoring & evaluation is thought to emphasize project performance, improve project effectiveness and efficiency, bring inclusivity in development as well as build social capital and empower poor people as platform in the region. In addition it is to empower the government project as it ensures accountability (Duggal, 2015). Monitoring & evaluation is instrumental in having better designed projects were shown the contribution of the stakeholders, ensuring benefits reach the intended beneficiaries and that effectiveness in terms of cost, protection and time are assured. It also aims at reducing incidences of corruption and ensuring ownership for equitable distribution of project benefits (Mansuri, 2016). Regional Partnership for Resource Development (2019) argued that monitoring & evaluation development begins a process of empowerment which enables the project stakeholders to take responsibility in designing and implementing their own initiatives and in the process this leads to project performance. If development is to be effective, the major project stakeholders should be involved by forming project implementation committees to oversee the activities of the various phases of the project cycle including but not limited to initiation,

planning, budgeting and procurement. For any development to be meaningful, monitoring & evaluation by all interest groups is inevitable and finally leads to sustainable development (Mulwa, 2017).

Rwanda, monitoring & evaluation was seen as one of the solutions for government projects sustainability especially for youth projects. Not only would participatory approaches assist project performance but it was argued that monitoring & evaluation would make projects more efficient and effective (Gee, 2016). The concept of project performance has made donors begin to think that "it is better to teach people to fish than give them donations of food.

While there has been a greater interest in monitoring & evaluation to research and development infrastructures such as road constructions for all citizens, we need a huge monitoring & evaluation for its project performance, there has also been an increased concern with monitoring and evaluation by donors, governments, NGOs and others (World Bank, 2010). This is affected by several factors: the trend in many management circles towards 'performance-based accountability' and 'management by results'; growing scarcity of funds, leading to a demand for demonstrated success; a move towards decentralization and devolution, providing a need for new forms of oversight; and the growing capacity of NGOs and community-based organizations as actors in the development process (Marisol & John, 2015).

There are two main ways to characterize monitoring and evaluation: by whom it is initiated and conducted, and whose perspectives are particularly emphasized. The first distinguishes between M&E that is externally led the efforts are generally organized and initiated externally and conducted mainly by individuals or groups considered as having no direct involvement or no direct personal or institutional interest in the outcome of the project or initiative; internally led the efforts are carried out mainly by those directly involved in project or programme planning and implementation; or jointly led (both internally and externally). The second distinguishes between which stakeholders are emphasized all major stakeholders including those who may be directly or indirectly affected by or involved in the project or programme interventions, beneficiaries of project or programme interventions, or marginalized groups, including all categories of people (Price S & Mylius, 2018).

The Rwanda's National Strategy for transformation (NST1) shows youth empowerment as one of the priority areas, meaning that all sectors and

programs should contribute to addressing the needs of the youth. The Ministry of youth and culture in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Rwanda and the Embassy of the Republic of Korea through the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA-Kigali) initiated the fund in November 2020 as an urgent response to the pandemic. More than 1,788 youth applied to its first round of funding, and 156 youth entrepreneurs were financially supported (UNDP, 2020). As Rwanda continues on its journey to sustainable development, its young generations will continue to be an important driving force, for that to happen youth need to be turned into job and wealth creators. Despite the funding opportunity offered by UNDP and other partners a number of funded projects failed at startup due to the lack of contracts and networks, social attitudes, entrepreneurship education, and regulatory framework.

#### **Statement of the problem**

The worldwide conventional method point-out that monitoring and evaluation are mostly done by external experts and usually upon completion of project/programme though sometimes mid-term. Over the past many years in Rwanda, youth projects have continuously reported non-sustainable outcomes of the projects in their daily (Belagis, 2019). The government of Rwanda has created a lot of development projects for different areas for the youths and it put a lot of energy for those projects to be succeeded. When we look at the ground some projects failed due to the lack of monitoring and evaluation practices. The project that was studied was AKAZI KANOZE Rwanda Youth Project sponsored by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and its main purpose was to provide Increase Livelihood Opportunities for Youth and Develop a Thriving Youth Livelihood Support System with a view of improving their living conditions. The pressure from government at times forces the project managers to act beyond the normal management principles (Belagis, 2019).

Today, it is time to work towards a sustainable development and project performance; where everything possible should be done to ensure that

#### **Review of Literature**

##### **Monitoring and Evaluation Planning**

Mackay (2017) says that most government's projects are considerable emphasis on the two uses of monitoring and evaluation; it's establishes that monitoring & evaluation, support evidence-based policy making such as budgeting, policy development, management of the projects and accountability. It is recognized that, governments in the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) generally understand that for a government to improve its own performance for

all youth projects assets contribute to excellent performance as well as its sustainability. Poor planning is negatively affecting youth projects performance and its strategic planning has taken a central point which affects youth projects performance. There are some youth projects which failed mainly due to monitoring and evaluation practices such as Art Rwanda Ubuhanzi and Youth National Talent Development Program (YouthConnekt Africa, 2017). Many projects failed due to lack of monitoring and evaluation practices, working beyond normal management principles, poor planning, poor communication in monitoring and evaluation practices, lack of resource allocation in monitoring and evaluation practices, lack of management participation, lack of involvement of beneficiaries that decreased authenticity of monitoring and evaluation practice, little or no performance of project activities, decreasing local level capacity in monitoring and evaluation. No available data on the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices with regard to youth project performance funded by UNDP Rwanda including this one. That is why this research was intended to find out the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices and youth project performance funded by UNDP Rwanda.

The objectives of the paper are:

- i. To determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation planning on performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda;
- ii. To determine the influence of communication in monitoring and evaluation on performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda;
- iii. To evaluate the influence of resource allocation in monitoring and evaluation on performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda;
- iv. To establish the influence of accountability in monitoring and evaluation practices on performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Rwanda

the project, it needs to devote substantial efforts to measuring its sustainability.

Several other researchers also gave their views on the essentials of monitoring and evaluation. Monsalve (2014) is another scholar who gave his contribution towards the rational of monitoring and evaluation tool in project management effectiveness. When development projects are effectively managed, the impact is evident to the beneficiaries. He asserts and said that monitoring and evaluation are fundamental aspects of good

programme management at all levels, be it national, regional and local. Monitoring and evaluation provides data on programme progress and effectiveness; it improves programme management and decision making; it allows accountability to stakeholders including funders; provides data for planning future resource needs and also it provides data useful for policy making and advocacy.

Diabre (2019) in the Handbook of Monitoring and Evaluation for Results contends that the growing demand for development effectiveness is largely based on the realization that produces good deliverables is not enough. Efficient or well managed projects and outputs will lose their relevancy if they yield no noticeable improvement in development conditions and ultimately in peoples' lives. The United Nations Development Programme is therefore increasing its focus on results and how it better contribute to them. The essence of this, therefore, is that, for any development project to be useful for longtime and have a positive change on the way of living of the beneficiaries it should increase its focus on results and the contribution should be visible from planning, monitoring and evaluation.

The rationale of monitoring and evaluation towards project success were also defended by Chinnanon (2017) where he asserts that Monitoring and evaluation can be an effective tool to enhance the quality of the project planning and management. It was noted that monitoring helps project managers and staff to understand whether the projects are progressing on schedule and to ensure that project inputs, activities, outputs, and the life of project in general. Therefore, monitoring and evaluation is a tool to help planners and managers to identifying sustainability of project. The comments that participatory approaches have also been mainstreamed in assets creation projects and is probably the most important change from past approaches and a factor in the success achieved and in the sustainability of the results. Also, in health and education projects adoption of the participatory approach is not yet systematic, but when undertaken has improved the level of project ownership and sustainability (WFP, 2016).

Induced participatory interventions work best when they are supported by a responsive state. The state does not necessarily have to be democratic though being democratic helps a great deal. But in the sphere in which the intervention is being conducted at the level of the community or the neighborhood the state has to be responsive to community demands (The World Bank, 2015). Even though community participation has had some success in improving outcomes in health and education, according to this report, it has been less effective in

reducing poverty, or in building the capacity for collective action.

Some of the common objectives and expected benefits of practicing monitoring and evaluation during the project cycle in development are improving the efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and coverage of projects and programmes and promoting stakeholder capacity, self-reliance and empowerment. Participation also entails costs to the different stakeholders. The Food and Agriculture Organization (2014) outlines such costs such as time costs for both the beneficiaries and the donors, including increased time for training, preparation and consultation, again there are likely to be financial costs to the donors. A hidden cost may be the shifting of responsibilities from national governments to the rural poor. Furthermore, the report stresses out that in order to monitor and evaluate stakeholder participation in development projects and programmes, it is necessary to identify the stakeholders, i.e. those who are affected by the outcome, negatively or positively, or those who can affect the outcomes of a proposed intervention.

Monitoring and evaluation is a powerful tool to produce many positive outcomes for agricultural and rural development initiatives. Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (2016) brings out the fact that these potential benefits can be realized by strengthening institutional and professional capacities for PM&E and this should have priority for agriculture and rural development, particularly at the community and local levels. Moreover, when it comes to determining its effectiveness, many programmes and projects in agriculture and rural development suffer from three common problems: a lack of clear objectives, lack of appropriate data, e.g. on livelihood improvement options and on the factors that can determine their success.

ADA (2016) suggests the following important questions which should be borne in mind by all evaluators: what is the probability of continued long-term benefits and the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time? Are the positive effects sustainable? How is the sustainability or the continuity of the intervention and its effects to be assessed? To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after donor intervention has ended? To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like e.g. economic, ecological, social and cultural aspects? How self-supporting in

particular is the assisted local counterpart? This will serve to enhance the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed.

Over the past ten years, the value of engaging key stakeholders has become critically linked to the achievement of downstream performance results. Experience has shown that if stakeholders have participated in the development of results, they are more likely to contribute to their implementation. However, it should be recognized that additional effort (and costs) is typically associated with expanded stakeholder involvement (Canadian International Development Agency, 2014). From the perspective of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) officer responsible for the Maternal and Child Health Project in China, participatory monitoring and evaluations (PM&E) is a critical part of RBM (Results Based Management) as stakeholders participate in the creation of results to be achieved and then remain involved in measuring and monitoring these results. PM&E broadens accountability by involving project stakeholders in co-creating a relevant monitoring and evaluation strategy. The propensity for significant outcomes and impacts is increased when stakeholders are actively involved with the determination and application of evaluation results. The involvement of communities in PM&E has many distinct advantages. It can provide better insights about the dynamics of project implementation, and generate useful information about the roles of key local stakeholders and how local resources are used. In addition, it helps foster a sense of ownership among local people with regard to the outcomes. This in turn enhances the prospects of sustainability of an initiative. Feedback obtained from communities about the strengths and limitations of a project can also help improve the design of interventions (IFAD, 2018). Simon and Morse (2015) included an additional learning zone to their framework based upon variants of the Kolb learning cycle (Kolb, 2014) which they think of as 'Sustainability Therapy'.

#### **Communication in monitoring and evaluation**

This report highlights a number of imperative patterns, challenges and approaches related with inquiring about, checking and assessing Communication for Improvement (C4D) inside the UN setting. It could be a key component of the Inquire about, Observing and Assessment (R, M&E) Asset Pack for C4D Programs. This Asset Pack is being created as portion of an progressing arrangement of techniques that point to regulated C4D inside the Universal Improvement Motivation, illustrate the commitments and impacts of C4D, and subsequently reinforce C4D's regulation position

inside the UN. To plan this report, we attempted a major writing survey and meetings with C4D Central Focuses or M&E pros from seven UN offices and a 15 part Master Board, who given broad inputs into the venture, counting proposed modifications to a draft of this report which was talked about at a arrangement of gatherings at UNICEF central command in Modern York in December 2010 (Pamer et al., 2018). There has been a move (in talk at slightest) from vertical one-way, top-down models of communication for improvement to flat models that point to encourage cooperation, incorporation and strengthening. Be that as it may, numerous approaches allude to both viewpoints in conflicting ways, coming about in disarray and unseemly compromises that restrain the viability of C4D activities. For case, communication is frequently marginalized, whereas at the same time, it is proclaimed as a major column for advancement and alter.

In hone, communication, as caught on by decision-makers, is frequently decreased to vertical data conveyance or open relations, instead of portion of a handle of important engagement in advancement forms. Differing approaches to C4D are taken over UN offices but the taking after four primary 'strands' have as of late been recognized: Behaviors Alter Communication (BCC) Communication for Social Alter (CFSC); Communication for promotion; Fortifying an empowering media and communication environment (McCall et al., 2019) Long-term investigate highlights a repeating issue with choice creators in improvement organizations not increasing in value what C4D implies, or its critical part in improvement. Choice producers within the UN frequently don't get it that C4D incorporates two-way communication frameworks that empower discourse, 'allow communities to talk out, express their goals and concerns and take an interest within the choices that relate to their development' (UN Determination 51/172, 1997). Incorporation of individuals on the ground in all stages of improvement forms is seen as a principal rule by dynamic advocates of C4D. Be that as it may, educate which prohibited communities might lock in with through communication are regularly fundamentally unsuited for listening, and improvement for the most part positions the destitute and marginalized as audience members instead of speakers.

#### **Accountability in monitoring and evaluation**

Project monitoring are many strategies using for project management and It provides understanding of the progress of the project so that appropriate corrective actions can be taken when the performance deviates significantly from the planned goals. It consists of regular systematic collection and

analysis of information to track the progress of the project implementation against pre-set targets and objectives. It is a necessary management tool which to use during project management, if used properly, provides continuous feedback on the project implementation progress as well assists in the identification of potential successes and constraints to facilitate timely decisions (Zall & Rist, 2017).

Effective monitoring of the project is a critical point of good project management. It supports informed and timely decision making by the management and provides accountability for achieving objectives. It is a key part of project cycle management. It is to be built into the project at the planning stage. It is not an 'add on' tool which can be used during mid-way of the project implementation. On the other hand, it is to be woven throughout the project.

Project monitoring clarifies project objectives, links activities and their resources to objectives, translates objectives into performance indicators and sets targets, routinely collects data on these indicators, compares actual results with targets, and results progress to the management and alerts the management about the problems which frequently gets cropped up during the implementation of the project. It provides information to the management whether the project is proceeding as per schedule relative to the targets or there is time over run in the project implementation. It also focuses, in particular, on the efficiency and the use of resources during the project implementation. It provides support to the management in its efforts to complete the project in time and within the budget (Woodhill, 2015).

Project monitoring activities take place in parallel with the project execution activities so that, while the project work is being executed, the project is being monitored by implementing the appropriate level of oversight for the purpose of the mid-way corrective actions. High quality monitoring of the project progress encourages timely decision making, ensures project accountability, and provides a robust foundation for successful completion of the project. It is through the continuous monitoring of project performance that the management has an opportunity to learn about what is working well, what is lagging behind, and what challenges are arising (Spreckely, 2019).

In the world at large, many speakers use the words accountability and responsibility interchangeably or to mean the same which leads to confusing results. It is true that both terms blur into each other. For example, when a government adopts certain public service assessment tools (e.g., budget reports), it is attempting either to enhance accountability or improve performance. This study distinguishes these terms as different dimensions of public

management (Halachmi, 2018). Performance is about whether resources have been used in the intended way in order to achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness, and fairness (Brewer & Selden, 2015; Halachmi, 2018) Accountability, by contrast, is defined as managing and meeting public and other expectations for performance and responsiveness (Kearns, 2016; Romzek & Dubnick, 2017). Through these definitions, it is possible to see that even though performance is satisfactory, accountability expectations may not be met. Accountability and responsibility have alternative meanings which are themselves distinct; leading to imprecision in their uses.

Further our understanding of accountability and performance as different dimensions of public management and of the effect of accountability on performance is a growing topic of scholarly study; it is emerging as a counterpart to studies of the effect of performance on accountability. Given the growing body of research on the determinants of performance (Rainey & Steinbauer, 2016), the focus of this study reminds us of the importance of accountability as an independent variable within the management performance nexus for better organisation (Dubnick, 2015). It is important to note, however, that this study's focus is not the effect of "conflicting" accountability (Kim & Lee, 2016) but the effect of "each dimension" of accountability. The literature finds perverse effects of conflicting accountability requirements (Romzek & Dubnick, 2017). Given the paradox or web of accountability in practice (Jos & Tompkins, 2014) and the prescriptive argument of balancing competing accountability requirements (Kim, 2015), more precise understanding is needed of the effect of each dimension of accountability requirements on work performance.

Accountability, everyone talks about accountability, shareholders demand it, leaders want it, employees are often afraid of it and stakeholder insist on it. The Merriam Webster dictionary defines accountability as "subject of having to report, explain or justify; answerable, responsible or liable to an act". Accountability can also be defined as the quality or state of being accountable that is an obligation or willingness to accept responsibility or to account for one's actions. It is the guiding principle that defines how employees makes commitments to one another, how they measure and report their wrong and how much ownership they take to things done. A key definition of accountability is 'a social relationship in which an actor feels an obligation to explain and to justify his or her conducts to some significant other' (Bovens, 2015). Accountability can also be defined differently based upon social, political, cultural and institutional conditions

(Dubnick & Frederickson, 2016). To explain and to justify their conduct, public organizations release information about their actions to the public. Thus, accountability is often seen as transparency of information. In addition to definitions of the concept, a variety of accountability frameworks for understanding accountability and its relationships has developed. The majority talk about a conflicting nature of accountability to which managers have to respond (Schillemans & Bovens, 2016).

The important implication is not solving the tension inherent in the need to address conflicting expectations but rather managing to “fulfill the public’s expectations” (Cooper, 2016), which provides a more “realistic picture” of today’s organizations and their environments (Acar & Yang, 2018). Romzek & Dubnick’s 2017 model is useful as a framework for understanding and to measuring accountability reflecting this implication. This more or less covers the comprehensive meaning of accountability mentioned by the scholars defining the concept. The five dimensions of accountability are made to accommodate Romzek & Dubnick’, (2017) idea of managing the expectations and environment. The first two kinds of accountability (transparency and liability) can be thought of as foundations that underpin accountability in all of its manifestations. There is greater tension between the three substantive conceptions of accountability controllability, responsibility, and responsiveness (Koppell, 2018).

#### **Resources allocation in monitoring and evaluation practices**

Resource allocation is the assignment and management of the assets in a way that supports the strategic goals of the M&E system of the project organization (Harris, 2014). Resource allocations aimed at ensuring that relevant assets have been assigned to the various activities of the M&E system in the project organization (Omollo, Ngacho & Onyango, 2017). There are different sets of resources that are needed for realization of the goals of the M&E system, which include finances, technologies, materials and people (human resources) (Maritan & Lee, 2017; & Lemarleni et al., 2017). Inadequate resource allocation may constrain the various activities supported by the M&E system in a project organization. Financial resources are important assets needed for well-functioning of the M&E system in a project organization (Omesa, Gachunga, Okibo & Ogutu, 2019). The various activities including data collection and analysis require funds and these determine the quality of the M&E reports and information generated in the project organization. Thus, inadequate funds would adversely affect the quality of the reports generated from the M&E system in the project. Well-

functioning M&E system requires an organization to set aside an adequate budget for the M&E department in place. Allocation of financial resources to the M&E system requires an organization to adopt budgetary practices (Kwarteng, 2018). Despite its role in project management, Ojha and Pandey (2017) shared that financial resource allocation has not been well conceptualized and understood especially in the context of M&E systems.

#### **Project performance**

Over the past few decades, open administration writing has centered exceptionally intensely on project execution. (Ingraham, 2015) famous in a discourse at the national conference for the American Society for Open project that “performance, at its heart is around governance and accountability”. Measuring execution makes a difference open supervisors oversee more efficiently and give open administrations more effectively. Performance measures are “periodic estimation in arrange to allow following of problems, progress, and trends” (Hatry et al. 2017). An open organization, these measures ought to be derived from the expressed missions, objectives, and destinations of the organization (Poister, 2013). Performance estimation is characterized by Poister as the method of characterizing watching, and using such measures. The framework that combines gathering information for execution measures and monitoring advance is called execution administration (VanDooren et al., 2015).

The subject of execution in open organizations is a continuous investigate theme for numerous public sector researchers. This proceeded intrigued within the subject of execution is to a great extent due to recent efforts within the open segment to redo public sector organizations more within the picture of private sector firms. Reexamination endeavors just like the Unused Open Administration have created a strongly center upon measuring execution. Bouckaert wrote a point by point history of execution measure utilization in the open division in 1990 (Williams, 2013). This article focuses to an awfully long history of using measures within the open sector, beginning within the early 1900s since of the want for a more efficient government. From the 1940s until the 1970s, open organizations were particularly interested in execution measures as a way to assist keep costs down. Within the 1970s, fetched control efforts were supplanted with the call to be proficient with citizen dollars. In the 1980s and 1990s, the developments were toward reevaluating government to guarantee most extreme productivity and effectiveness.



### **Critical Review and Research Gap identification**

The literature reviewed indicates monitoring and evaluation practices in a project are very important to the project performance. It will be observed that responsibility assignment should be involved at all levels of a project and these levels have been identified as planning, implementation stage and monitoring and evaluation stages. It was seen that each level of involvement has its own impact on the overall success of project. Much as involvement leads to good performance of projects, it also has negative effects like the time and financial costs involved. However, the costs of monitoring and evaluation practices should be weighed with the benefits.

The review identified the need for effective monitoring and evaluation practices in project and program interventions. This shows that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is increasingly recognized as an important project management tool. It also recognizes the need to improve the performance of donor development finance. This requires management to carefully consider the provision of information to support project implementation.

Full feedback is important when developing new projects. In addition, M&E also ensures accountability in the use of development resources. A closer look The review shows that, despite the importance of adopting and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation practices in programmes, little attention has been paid to questioning and examining whether these practices affect program performance in donor-funded programmes. There has been some valuable research on the impact of project performance monitoring and evaluation on project performance. Some researchers mentioned that there is little research on monitoring and evaluation of program performance in the Kenya chapter. These few studies have not extensively focused on the main impact of monitoring and evaluation on program performance (Hassan, 2013; Magondu, 2013; Marangu, 2012; Muriithi & Crawford, 2013). This study will attempt to address knowledge gaps to identify practices for monitoring and evaluating UNEP GEF programs and program performance.

Issue of monitoring and evaluation practices is gaining considerable interest in projects (Lui, 2017). Many researchers have looked at monitoring and evaluation practices and performance of projects but not much literature is found in other project. Barbara, carol & Ken (2015) examined monitoring and evaluation practices and success of projects, Shamas & Stephen (2019) concentrated on stakeholders and success of large construction projects, Hemanta (2017) looked at stakeholders

influence on infrastructure projects while Kirsir (2016) emphasized international projects. This therefore, makes it pertinent for an investigation of monitoring and evaluation practices and success of projects.

The research gap also identified is that though several studies have occurred before on the subject of monitoring and evaluation practices, most of them have occurred outside Rwanda for instance that by Harry (2019) in the UK and in France, Norway and China by Erling, David, Svein & Arthur (2014). This justifies the area of case study located in different districts in particular as well as Rwanda in general since little or no attention has been given to it. Previous studies have also been concentrating youth project in general like Harry (2019) who concentrated on entrepreneurship education.

When success of monitoring and evaluation practices will be set up, it was emphasized that monitoring and evaluation practices has to be involved at all levels of implementation. What is not yet clear is whether clear the strides being made in the field of youth projects in monitoring and evaluation practices are due to the involvement, engagement and great partnership with the key stakeholders in the area or whether it is because of other factors. This also creates a research gap which has prompted the researcher to examine the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices.

### **Theoretical Review**

Theoretical review involves the review of theories underlying the study topic. Theories covered in this study include: Theory of Constraints, Conflicting Theories, Criticism Theories and Stakeholders' theory.

#### **Theory of Constraints**

The theory of constraints is a set of management tools created by Eliyahu Goldratt in 1984. The theory is applicable in many areas including project management and performance measurement among many others (Blackstone, 2017). The theory helps organizations to identify the most important constraints or bottlenecks in their processes and systems and dealing with them to improve performance. According to Goldratt (2014), organizational performance is dictated by constraints present in processes and systems. Constraints are restrictions that hinder an organization from maximizing its performance and achieving its goals and objectives (Goldratt, 2014). He states that constraints can involve policies, equipment, information, supplies or even people, and can be either internal or external to an organization.

Theory of constraints can be applied in conjunction with other management techniques such as total

quality management and risk management to ensure a comprehensive set of techniques that ensure continuous improvement in all areas of operation in an organization (IMA, 2009). The theory is based on five steps which include: identifying the system's constraints that limit progress toward the goal, exploiting the most important constraint, subordinating everything else to the decision made by managing the system's policies, processes and resources to support the decision, elevating the constraint by adding capacity or changing the status of the original resources to increase the overall output of the constraining task or activity, and finally going back to step one and identify the next most important constraint (Steyn, 2016). The five steps in applying the theory of constraints enable an organization's management to remain focused on the most important constraints in their systems.

Theory of constraints is applicable in many aspects of project management. Monitoring and evaluation are done throughout the steps on the theory of constraints to record information regarding the progress of managing the constraints. Step five of the theory of constraints provides for feedback which is important in evaluation of results to determine whether there is progress in achieving project goals and objectives (Steyn, 2016).

Any project risk might be a constraint or could become a constraint (Steyn, 2016). In most cases, risk events that are initially not considered as posing the highest risk are neglected. Often, this may result in a risk event that was initially considered as not being critical becoming the most important constraint. Once a risk event has been identified as important or critical, the focus is to eliminate the risk or reduce either the probability of its occurrence or its impact to a level where it would not be critical anymore (Steyn, 2016). Project leadership is critical in executing the theory of constraints. It involves managing project schedules to ensure projects are completed on time and within the scope and budget (IMA, 2019). Managing constraints requires project leaders to coordinate their project teams in order to minimize the effects of constraints effectively. Stakeholder participation is important in any project or organization as they contribute to decision-making to enhance the quality of products and services. While executing a project, stakeholder needs could be expected to change, which leads to changes in scope of the project, (Steyn, 2016). It helps management focus on what's important by identifying individual constraints that inhibit the organization from achieving its goals. The process allows organizations to identify the root cause for poor performance

### **Conflicting Theories**

When reviewing the literature, the researcher established that, though there were no strong conflicting theories in the area of monitoring and evaluation, there are still some areas where different authors had divergent emphasis in regard to the importance of monitoring and evaluation systems and tools to enhancing project performance. Gizachew (2013) dwelt much on specific type of monitoring and evaluation where he says that, for M&E to be successful, it has to be participatory. Mackay (2017) on the other hand, without specifying the type of monitoring and evaluation to be employed, emphasized the four importance of M&E concepts; project durability, policy development, management of the projects and accountability. Monsalve (2014) shared the same views with Mackay, and had two more important aspects of monitoring and evaluation where he said that, it provides data for planning future resource needs and advocacy.

Bambarger (2016) like other authors acknowledges the importance of beneficiaries' participation in project monitoring and evaluation tools for project performance, but used a different approach where he said that, it's a powerful tool for learning about what works, what does not, and the reasons why. It is important to note however, that, though sometimes used divergent wording and ideas, there common words that keep coming when talking about the importance of monitoring and evaluation tools in project management. This theory was used to determine clearly the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on sustainability of World Bank funded project and how conflict can affect negatively project performance.

### **Criticism Theories**

Different evaluators often regard monitoring as playing a secondary and relatively simple role compared to evaluation proper. He notes that the view underestimates the potential of monitoring information in enhancing the value of evaluative work, in particular to increase the 'half-life' of evaluation findings. In fact, his concern was that, the advocates of this theory ignored the fact that, monitoring complements the fragmented and ad-hoc nature of evaluation work, so that the process of monitoring presents an opportunity to develop a framework within which individual evaluations exists (De Boer, 2016).

Evaluation also has been criticized in a sense that good evaluations need expertise, resources, and above all time. This normally leads to a lagged cycle of commissioning evaluations to address policy questions, only to have evaluations reported well after the necessary decisions have been made.

Conversely, decision-makers often view earlier evaluations as out of date; and rightly or wrongly, irrelevant to current policy questions. While monitoring and evaluation is understood to serve a range of purposes, it is unfortunate that, sometimes, is erroneously viewed as an annoying task of simply providing donors with the information they require (Woodhill, 2018). Certainly, accountability to funding bodies is one function of an effective monitoring and evaluation system, but it is certainly not the only or the most important function. This theory was used to know importance of the criticism in the projects and how criticism can affect performance of the project.

### **Stakeholders' theory**

The theory that guided this study was stakeholders' theory. Stakeholder theory first developed in 1950's and during 1960's (Kippenberger, 2016). This was during post-war period as economic growth raised living standards that both employees with strong unions and consumer groups started to challenge the power and might of modern organizations. Management of these organizations had to accept that there were other interested parties beyond themselves and their shareholders of whom they would have to take some account.

Freeman in 2015 was the first scholar to present a theory assessing the role of actors in the firm's environment. He states that organizations operations are affected by both internal and external actor's behaviour besides stockholders (Susan, 2017). The theory says that all stakeholders must be identified and listed and that they are supposed to shape the organizational structure and behaviour. Mellisa, (2012) quotes freeman's book,

### **Materials and Methods**

The research was descriptive and analytical research design; it is key role in statistics and data analysis. Descriptive research classifies, describes, compares, and measures data; it is also identified characteristics, frequencies, trends, and categories for the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices and youth project performance funded by UNDP Rwanda. The study was based on a single case study to enable a broad cross section of researchers to facilitate the great understanding of the phenomenon and apply a series of statistical tests to help in the presentation of the data via mean, standard deviation, correlation and regression analysis.

### **Target Population**

Population was the staff management, members and Digital Mental Health Project Funded By UNDP Rwanda and was comprised by 180 people. This was the study population though a convenient sample

Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach that the firm exists for the purpose of serving stakeholder interests. A stakeholder has been defined as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by achievement of an organizations purpose (Mellissa, 2012). There is a consensus that stakeholders often include customers, employees, management, stockholders, creditors, suppliers, community and even competitors (Stark, 2014). Evan and Freeman (2015) say that stakeholder theory does not give primacy to one stakeholder group over the other. He further emphasizes participation and that all members have the right to participate in the decisions which affect the accomplishment of their projects in an important way.

Whereas it may be correct to suggest that the firm's survival be linked to external, the motivating description of this linkage needs to be more clearly addressed. Further Hill and Jones (2016) beg to differ from Evan and Freeman above by saying that some stakeholders have more primacy than others and may vary with respect to the degree of importance management places on their stakes and with respect to the amount of power the stakeholder has with management. Carroll also conquers with Hill and Jones by saying that stakeholders with more power and legitimacy require more attention as quoted by (Starik, 2014). Shareholder theory was used it to challenge corporate leaders and project owners to rethink their usual approaches to management. It advocates managers shifting the primary focus of the education projects away from short-term performance and toward long-term success.

which was taken based on sampling design represented.

### **Sample Size**

There are many ways of calculating sample size, but the researcher may need to calculate the necessary sample size for a different combination of levels of precision, confidence, and variability. Due to the information needed, the researcher decided to use all population as simple size thus simple was 180respondents.

### **Sampling technique**

#### **Universal sampling**

As all population was a sample size. The sample was, therefore, be made of number the staff management, stakeholders and employees of Digital Mental Health Project Funded By UNDP Rwanda Data Collection Methods

Data collection is the systematic gathering of data using a specified scientific process (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Poor selection of data collection

methods affects the collected data. Research was adopted the questionnaire for collecting primary data and documentation review to collect secondary data.

Here it follows a rationale that once questionnaires and other data collection tools have been administered the mass of collected raw data must be systematically organized in a manner that facilitates analysis. Thus, data from completed questionnaire was edited, categorized and entered into the computer SPSS and summarized using simple frequency counts and percentage distribution for analysis, mean and standard deviation was used during data analysis. In relation to qualitative analysis the researcher used the

collected information from the respondents to establish patterns and relationships with the area being studied. Quantitatively the researcher summarized data using descriptive statistics like graphs, percentages and frequencies which enabled the researcher to meaningfully describe the distribution of scores and measurements. Using these techniques, the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the findings made it easy to comprehend and draw conclusions were based on the findings. A regression model was provided a function that was describe the relationship between one or more independent variables and a response, dependent, or target variable.

#### 4. Results

##### 4.1 Descriptive of the respondents of monitoring and evaluation planning

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Its helps to address all issues of measuring project performance and achievement of the projects scope for Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.02	1.096
Monitoring and evaluation planning aims for determining the fulfillment of project objectives, measurement of the project's efficiency, effectiveness for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	3.88	1.229
Monitoring and evaluation planning has a significance and impact, as well as incorporate the learning of lessons in the decision-making process for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.21	.939
It helps project managers track the progress and ensures that the project remains on time for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.24	.899
Valid N (listwise)	180		

Source: Primary data, (2023)

The findings indicated that for the first statement that stated that “Its helps to address all issues of measuring project performance and achievement of the projects scope for Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” “the respondents agreed with a mean of 4.02 and standard deviation of 1.096 with the statement and this indicated that the respondents strongly agreed

with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”.

The second statement evaluated that “Monitoring and evaluation planning aims for determining the fulfillment of project objectives, measurement of the project's efficiency, effectiveness for the

performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda”where the respondents strongly agreed with a mean of 3.88 and standard deviation of 1.229. “This indicated that the respondents agreed with the statement as indicated by the weak mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement.

The third statement evaluated was “Monitoring and evaluation planning has a significance and impact, as well as incorporate the learning of lessons in the decision-making process for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda

" this was measured by a mean of 4.21 and standard deviation of .939. This indicated that the

respondents are strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”. The last statement evaluated was “It helps project managers track the progress and ensures that the project remains on time for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” this was measured by a mean of 4.24 and standard deviation of .899. This indicated that the respondents are strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”.

#### 4.2 Descriptive of the respondents on communication in monitoring and evaluation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Communication in monitoring and evaluation among staff and employees brings the desired performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.22	.931
There are different ways used in project prepared to communicate to the project beneficiaries in order to obtain real performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	3.99	.771
There are challenges in communication in monitoring and evaluation faced by members that affect performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.76	.991
Staff management trains employees to the effective communication for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.40	.823
Valid N (listwise)	180		

#### Source: Primary data (2023)

The findings indicated that for the first statement that stated that “Communication in monitoring and evaluation among staff and employees brings the desired performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” “the respondents agreed with a mean of 4.22 and standard deviation of .931 with the statement and this indicated that the respondents strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”.

The second statement evaluated that “There are different ways used in project prepared to communicate to the project beneficiaries in order to obtain real performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” where the respondents strongly agreed with a mean of 3.99 and standard deviation of .771. “This indicated that the respondents agreed with the statement as indicated by the weak mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement.

The third statement evaluated was “There are challenges in communication in monitoring and evaluation faced by members that affect performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” this was measured by a mean of 4.76 and standard deviation of .991. This indicated that the respondents are strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”. The last

statement evaluated was “Staff management trains employees to the effective communication for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” this was measured by a mean of 4.40 and standard deviation of .823. This indicated that the respondents are strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”.

**Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics on resource allocation in monitoring and evaluation**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
It helps with identifying the most valuable and efficient use of resources for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	3.94	1.173
It provides the necessary data to guide strategic planning for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	4.00	1.172
It helps project managers in keeping track the implementation of the projects and its prudence in the utilization of the resources for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	3.90	1.104
Resource allocation in monitoring and evaluation competing interests determine what is allocated for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda	180	3.84	1.113
Valid N (listwise)	180		

**Source: Primary data (2023)**

The findings indicated that for the first statement that stated that “It helps with identifying the most valuable and efficient use of resources for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” “the respondents agreed with a mean of 3.94 and standard deviation of 1.173 with the statement and this indicated that the respondents strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”.

The second statement evaluated that “It provides the necessary data to guide strategic planning for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” where the respondents strongly agreed with a mean of 4.00 and standard deviation of 1.172. “This indicated that the respondents agreed with the statement as indicated by the weak mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement.

The third statement evaluated was “It helps project managers in keeping track the

implementation of the projects and its prudence in the utilization of the resources for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” this was measured by a mean of 3.90 and standard deviation of 1.104. This indicated that the respondents are strongly agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”. The last

## 5. Conclusions

Following the discussions from the findings, monitoring and evaluation practices in all aspects of M&E of the project as well as its performance. This shows that even if Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda ends its interventions, the beneficiaries can still continue the project’s activities for a long time without any assistance because their capacities have been built and strengthened through the various trainings and economic empowerments to ensure the project becomes sustainable.

The overall involvement of the beneficiaries participatory in M&E has empowered them to find solutions to their problems and use the solution as a recommendation for planning for future activities. A very limited number of them participate in a few of the M&E activities, they do not do self-evaluations nor monitor how the project is being implemented so that they can suggest possible ways to make it more effective. Because they participate in M&E only to a very small extent, they cannot therefore know how to handle the project’s activities should the intervention cease. No assessments have been conducted to evaluate the sustainability of the project even after some years of its non-existence, which is not a good sign for the guarantee of project sustainability.

The Pearson correlation also shows that even though PM&E has an impact on project

## 6. Recommendations

### To the Government of Rwanda

The outcome of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda suggests that PM&E methodologies are effective strategies for building beneficiaries’ capacities, facilitating various forms of empowerment and identifying strategies to increase sustainability and performance of projects.

The research findings suggest that implementing these strategies and conducting PM&E in Digital

statement evaluated was “Resource allocation in monitoring and evaluation competing interests determine what is allocated for the performance of Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda” this was measured by a mean of 3.84 and standard deviation of 1.113. This indicated that the respondents are agreed with the statement as indicated by the strong mean and heterogeneity of answers as indicated by the standard deviation where the respondents had different opinions of the statement”.

sustainability, the impact is not high because PM&E is low as well as the respondents’ perceptions on the indicators for project sustainability. It can therefore be concluded that PM&E is a necessary tool for long term sustainability so that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continue after the end of the project. As a result of the active involvement of primary stakeholders in reflection, assessment and action, a sense of ownership is created, capacities are built, beneficiaries are empowered and lessons learned are applied both in the field and at the programme level, increasing effectiveness.

M&E planning process, M&E technical expertise, stakeholder’s management involvement in M&E has a positive and significant impact. Impact on project implementation in Rwanda, with these conclusions in mind, more responsible authorities should consider hiring experts to address this issue. An effective monitoring and evaluation plan helps guide the planning process. From here, the authorities should also consider improving the capacities of the technical staff. Monitoring and evaluation, so are the various stakeholders in the project. You are invited to actively participate in project monitoring and evaluation. Ultimately, management must play an active rather than passive role in monitoring and evaluation.

Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda and also increasing the number of trainings to the primary beneficiaries, should contribute to increase its performance. Project implementers should involve policy makers at an early stage in the project if policy support is likely to be required to achieve project objectives. This is particularly important when attempting to improve its performance.

### To the Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda

All institutions particularly Digital Health as one of the Youth Project Funded by UNDP Rwanda and international organizations should involve their beneficiaries' participation and even the employees in M&E because it is believed that participation would lead to empowerment through capacity building, skills and training. By increasing the ability of people, projects and/or communities to be self-reliant, they are then able to contribute towards the performance of development projects which in turn contribute to the broader notion of sustainable national development.

### Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge Dr. Joseph TINDYEBWA for her contribution to this work from the beginning up to its completion. I also wish to extend my acknowledgement to the Mount Kenya

### Reference

1. Acar & Yang, (2018). *Project Leadership for Sustainability*. In: *AIPM National Conference, Canberra, October 2008, Sydney, Australia: Australian Institute of Project Management*.
2. Acar et al., (2018). *Guidelines for project and programme evaluations*. Imprint: The Operational unit of the Austrian development cooperation. Zelinkagasse 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria.
3. ADA, (2016). *Factors Influencing Effective Implementation of Monitoring And Evaluation Practices in Donor Funded Projects In Kenya: A Case of Turkana District*. Unpublished MBA Research Project, Kenyatta University, 2011.
4. Alison & Eleanor (2019). *What Determines the Effectiveness of Community-Based Water Projects*. *Social Capital Initiative Working Paper, 14*.
5. Bambarger, N. (2016). *Project Sustainability and Participatory Planning Approach. A Case Study of Rural Water Supply and Health Project in Marginal Areas*.
6. Barbara, carol & Ken (2015). *The project sustainability will vary somewhat, depending on the nature of the project participation of stakeholders*.
7. Belagis, D. (2019). *Evaluating institutional sustainability in development programs*. *Journal of international development, 10*
8. Bailey, M. (2010). *Research Methodology* London Pearson Education Limited.
9. Blackstone, C. (2017). *Sampling the Evidence of Extension Program Impact*. Program evaluation and organizational development, IFAS, University of Florida. PEOD-5. October.
10. Bovens, N. (2015). *Monitoring and evaluating stakeholder participation in agriculture and rural development projects*.
11. Brewer & Selden, (2015). *Participatory Project Identification and Planning, A Regional Partnership for Resource Development publication*, Signal Press Ltd, IFDM Gardens off Ngong Road Nairobi
12. Canadian International Development Agency, (2016). *Canadian International Development Agency, (2016). How to perform evaluations - participatory evaluations*. Prepared by the CIDA performance review branch.
13. Chambers, R. (2019). *Community Participation in Project Planning, Management and Implementation: Building the Foundation for Sustainable Development*. *International Journal of Current Research, 5(02), 398-401*.
14. Chinnanon, H. (2017). *Participation in development, development theory and practice: Critical perspective*. Working paper 15, University of Massachusetts.
15. Cooper, D. (2016). *Managing Community-Based Development: Unmasking the Mastery of Participatory Development*, PREMESE Olivex Publishers, Nairobi.
16. De Boer, (2016). *Can good projects succeed in bad communities? Collective action in the Himalayas* mimeo, Harvard University, 45.
17. Diabre, G. (2019). *Impact monitoring and evaluation system for farmer field schools in Kyrgyzstan: How to optimize resource allocation for higher impact*. *Journal of*

### To the Beneficiaries

Furthermore the recommendations to employees of beneficiaries were suggested: The beneficiaries should keep in mind that they need to protect the infrastructures for better performance; encouragement systems should be set up on all levels of leadership to encourage beneficiaries to integrate strategies and activities supporting each other into their work; Beneficiary's communication between them at all levels should be put in place and beneficiaries should be self-motivated in order to show their ability and capacity.

University, Digital Mental Health Project Funded By UNDP Rwanda authorities for their support and collaboration during the data collection



- Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 2(10), pp. 211-218.
18. Dominique & Ingrid, (2015). Communication for Sustainable Development: Indicators for Impact Assessment in USAID Project "Educational Reform in the Classroom in Guatemala." *Journal of Latin American Communication Research*, 2, 2.
  19. Dubnick & Frederickson, (2016). Building community capacities in evaluating rural IT projects: Success strategies from the LEARNERS Project. *International journal of education and development using information and communication technology*, 1, Issue 1, pp. 13-31.
  20. Dubnick, S. (2015). *Who counts reality? Participatory monitoring and evaluation: A literature review* IDS working paper 70.
  21. Duggal, O. (2015). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation in Latin America: overview of the literature with annotated bibliography*. Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex.
  22. Erling, David, Svein & Arthur (2014). *Participation and project sustainability: Participatory integrated development in rain-fed areas (PIDRA) project in East Java – Indonesia*. Master's degree dissertation, department of Philosophy, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
  23. Evan and Freeman (2015). Innovative and Sustainable Management of Building and Infrastructure projects as published in the conference proceedings.
  24. Foddy, E. (2013). *Introduction to the Philosophy of Research Methodology*. London: Sage Publications.
  25. Galton, G. (1911). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications
  26. Gee, F. (2016). *An Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation of Communication for Social Change*.
  27. Gizachew, M. (2015). Role of monitoring and Evaluation on performance of public organization project in Kenya. *International journal of innovative Development & policy studies*, 3(3), 12-27.
  28. Goldratt, I. (2014). *Sustainability Issues in Civil Engineering: Methods and techniques (4th edition)*. Kansensero: Global Publishers Ltd.
  29. Greg, Lyn & Megan, (2015). *Monitoring and evaluation for sustainable agriculture and rural development*.
  30. Gyorkos, T. (2016). *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community projects*, Paulines Publications Africa, Nairobi, Kenya p. 13
  31. Halachmi, A. (2018). Influence of stakeholders participation on performance of Road projects at Kenya National Highways authority. *Journal of Business Management*, 1(11), 384-404.
  32. Harris, H. (2014). *Impact and sustainability of Water Supply and Sanitation Program in Developing Countries*. *Journal of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environment Management*. Vol. 13, .292-296.
  33. Hatry et al. (2017). *A Synthesis of monitoring and evaluation experience in the renewable natural resources research strategy*.
  34. IFAD, (2018). *The role of Monitoring and Evaluation on project sustainability in Rwanda*. *Journal of Business and social sciences*, 5(7), 159-177.
  35. Ika et al, (2016). Project Monitoring and Evaluation as a value-for money tool.
  36. Ingraham, A. (2015). *Participation and development: perspectives from the comprehensive development paradigm*. *Review of Development Economics* 6, 163-182.
  37. Jackofsky, H. (2014). *Evaluating participation processes in community development*. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 18, 371-383.
  38. Jan, S. (2017). Delivering sustainability therapy in sustainable development projects. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 75(1), pp. 37-51.
  39. Jos & Tompkins, (2014). Impact monitoring and evaluation system for farmer field schools in Kyrgyzstan: How to optimize resource allocation for higher impact. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 2(10), pp. 211-218.
  40. Kearns, L. (2016). Factors Influencing Effective Implementation of Monitoring And Evaluation Practices in Donor Funded Projects In Kenya: A Case of Turkana District. *Unpublished MBA Research Project*, Kenyatta University, 2011.
  41. Kim & Lee, (2016). *Project Leadership for Sustainability*. In: AIPM National Conference, Canberra, October 2008, Sydney, Australia: Australian Institute of Project Management
  42. Kim, Z. (2015). *Guidelines for project and programme evaluations*. Imprint: The Operational unit of the Austrian development cooperation. Zelinkagasse 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria.
  43. Kippenberger, G. (2016). *Project Leadership for Sustainability*. In: AIPM National Conference, Canberra, October 2008,

- Sydney, Australia: Australian Institute of Project Management.
44. Kirsi, N. (2016). What Determines the Effectiveness of Community-Based Water Projects. *Social Capital Initiative Working Paper, 14*.
  45. Kolb, E. (2014). *Rethinking the Triple Constraint. Let's think critically about...* Eid, M., 2011. Integrating Sustainable Development into Project management
  46. Komalawati, Q. (2018). *Project Sustainability and Participatory Planning Approach. A Case Study of Rural Water Supply and Health Project in Marginal Areas*.
  47. Koppell, P. (2018). *The project sustainability will vary somewhat, depending on the nature of the project participation of stakeholders*.
  48. Kwarteng, V. (2018). *Sampling the Evidence of Extension Program Impact*. Program evaluation and organizational development, IFAS, University of Florida. PEOD-5. October.
  49. Lemarleni et al., (2017). *Monitoring and evaluating stakeholder participation in agriculture and rural development projects*.
  50. Lui, F. (2017). *Participatory Project Identification and Planning, A Regional Partnership for Resource Development publication*, Signal Press Ltd, IFDM Gardens off Ngong Road Nairobi
  51. Mackay, K. (2017). *Community Participation in Project Planning, Management and Implementation: Building the Foundation for Sustainable Development*. International Journal of Current Research, 5(02), 398-401.
  52. Mansuri, W. (2016). *Participation in development, development theory and practice: Critical perspective*. Working paper 15, University of Massachusetts.
  53. Marisol & John, (2015). *Managing Community-Based Development: Unmasking the Mastery of Participatory Development*, PREMESE Olivex Publishers, Nairobi.
  54. Maritan & Lee, (2017). Lessons from evaluation of cropping practices in Yunnan Province, China: Overview of the effectiveness of technologies and issues related to technology adoption. *Journal of sustainability, 1*, pp 628-661.
  55. Mellisa, G. (2014). *Socio-economic methodologies for natural resources research. Best practice guidelines participatory monitoring and evaluation for natural Resource management and research*. International Institute for Environment and Development.
  56. Monsalve, T. (2014). Impact monitoring and evaluation system for farmer field schools in Kyrgyzstan: How to optimize resource allocation for higher impact. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, 2*(10), pp. 211-218.
  57. Mulwa, V. (2017). Communication for Sustainable Development: Indicators for Impact Assessment in USAID Project "Educational Reform in the Classroom in Guatemala." *Journal of Latin American Communication Research, 2*, 2
  58. Ojha and Pandey (2017). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation in Latin America: overview of the literature with annotated bibliography*. Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex.
  59. Omesa, Gachunga, Okibo & Ogutu, (2019). *Participation and project sustainability: Participatory integrated development in rain-fed areas (PIDRA) project in East Java – Indonesia*. Masters degree dissertation, department of Philosophy, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
  60. Omollo, Ngacho & Onyango, (2017). Building community capacities in evaluating rural IT projects: Success strategies from the LEARNERS Project. *International journal of education and development using information and communication technology, 1*, Issue 1, pp. 13-31.
  61. Pamer et al., (2018). Innovative and Sustainable Management of Building and Infrastructure projects as published in the conference proceedings.
  62. Pasteur and Turrall (2016). Influence of stakeholders participation on performance of Road projects at Kenya National Highways authority. *Journal of Business Management, 1*(11), 384-404.
  63. Poister, B. (2013). *Monitoring and evaluation for sustainable agriculture and rural development*.
  64. Price S & Mylius, (2018). *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community projects*, Paulines Publications Africa, Nairobi, Kenya p. 13
  65. Rainey & Steinbauer, (2016). Role of monitoring and Evaluation on performance of public organization project in Kenya. *International journal of innovative Development & policy studies, 3*(3), 12-27.
  66. Romzek & Dubnick's (2017). *Impact and sustainability of Water Supply and Sanitation Program in Developing Countries*. *Journal of the Chartered Institution of Water*

- and Environment Management. Vol. 13, .292-296.*
67. Sarah, M. (2012). *Fundamental of research methodology in statistics, New Age International, New Delhi.*
68. Schillemans & Bovens, (2016). *The role of Monitoring and Evaluation on project sustainability in Rwanda. Journal of Business and social sciences, 5(7), 159- 177.*
69. Shamas & Stephen, (2019). *A Synthesis of monitoring and evaluation experience in the renewable natural resources research strategy.*
70. Simon and Morse (2015). *Monitoring & Evaluation Tips for strengthening organizational capacity.* Washington DC: World Bank.
71. Smith, F (2012). *Participation and development: perspectives from the comprehensive development paradigm.* Review of Development Economics 6, 163-182.
72. Spreckely, D. (2019). *When do Participatory Development Projects Work?*
73. Stark, P. (2014). *Participation and development: perspectives from the comprehensive development paradigm.* Review of Development Economics 6, 163-182.
74. Steyn, F. (2016). *Delivering sustainability therapy in sustainable development projects. Journal of Environmental Management, 75(1), pp. 37–51.*
75. Stiglitz, R. (2018). *Overview of participative action approaches in Australian land and water management. In 'Participative approaches for Land care'. (Ed. K Keith) pp. 5-42. (Australian Academic Press: Brisbane).*
76. Susan, F. (2017). *Ensuring Sustainability of community-based development projects as an attribute of good governance: A Paper presented at the Project Management Institute (PMI), Nigeria.*
77. Teresa, H. (1992). *Qualitative Interview Design: A Practical Guide for Novice Investigators. The Qualitative Report, Vol. 15(3), 754-760*
78. UNDP, (2020). *Project Monitoring and Evaluation, in Topics: Participation and Civic Engagement (a).* Washington DC.
79. VanDooren et al., (2015). *Project monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) with pastoralists: a view of experiences and annotated bibliography* Eschborn.
80. WFP, (2016). *Monitoring and evaluation.* Retrieved from website: [www.wfp.org](http://www.wfp.org)
81. Williams, C. (2013). *Participatory Project Identification and Planning, A Regional Partnership for Resource Development publication, Signal Press Ltd, IFDM Gardens off Ngong Road Nairobi*
82. Woodhill, X. (2018). *Community Participation in Project Planning, Management and Implementation: Building the Foundation for Sustainable Development.* International Journal of Current Research, 5(02), 398-401.
83. Woodhill, G. (2015). *Challenges in Monitoring and Evaluation: An opportunity to institutionalize M&E systems.* Working Paper No. 55853. Caribbean, Latin America.
84. World Bank, (2014). *Rethinking the Triple Constraint. Let's think critically about...* Eid, M., 2011. *Integrating Sustainable Development into Project management*
85. Zall & Rist, (2017). *Improving environmental sustainability in road projects.* Retrieved on 15/02/2017 from: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org).