

$Y = .761 + 0.873X_1 + 0.776X_2 + 0.688X_3 + e$, where Y is Timely Completion of Project; X_1 is Logical Framework Approach; X_2 is Theory based M&E Approach; X_3 is Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach, and e is the significance level. The significance levels of the independent variables were; Logical Framework Approach ($p = .010$); Theory based M&E Approach ($p = .026$); and Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach ($p = .013$). The model was significant in predicting the influence of M&E approaches given that the p values were < 0.05 and < 0.01 .

The positive coefficient demonstrated that an increase of 1% on Logical Framework Approach was attributed to 0.873% improvement in Timely Completion of Project and the t-statistic value (1.531) shown that the impact was statistically significant at the 98% confidence level. An increase of 1% on Theory based M&E Approach was attributed to 0.776% improvement in Timely Completion of Project and the t-statistic value (1.547) shown that the impact was statistically significant at the 98% confidence level. An increase of 1% on Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach was attributed to 0.688% improvement in Timely Completion of Project and the t-statistic value (2.546) shown that the impact was statistically significant at the 98% confidence level. The regression model provided a statistical control through which the study established the influence of each predictor variable, and hence suggesting that the Timely Completion of Project was exhibited in terms of Logical Framework Approach, Theory based M&E Approach, and Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach. The coefficients for each independent variable were non-zero, which meant that all the independent variables influenced the dependent variables.

Table 7: Regression Coefficients, Beneficiary Satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.569	1.140		4.533	.000
Logical Framework Approach	.733	.188	.820	.775	.023
Theory based M&E Approach	.630	.133	.714	.984	.002
Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach	.763	.140	.899	2.584	.012

a. Dependent Variable: Beneficiary Satisfaction

Source: Primary Data, 2021

The regression model derived from Table 7 was as follows:

$Y = .569 + 0.820X_1 + 0.714X_2 + 0.899X_3 + e$, where Y is Beneficiary Satisfaction; X_1 is Logical Framework Approach; X_2 is Theory based M&E Approach; X_3 is Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach, and e is the significance level. The significance levels of the independent variables were; Logical Framework Approach ($p = .023$); Theory based M&E Approach ($p = .002$); and Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach ($p = .012$). The model was significant in predicting the influence of M&E approaches given that the p values were < 0.05 and < 0.01 .

An increase of 1% on Logical Framework Approach was attributed to 0.820% improvement in Beneficiary Satisfaction and the t-statistic value (.775) showed that the impact was statistically significant at the 98% confidence level. An increase of 1% on Theory based M&E Approach was attributed to 0.714% improvement in Beneficiary Satisfaction and the t-statistic value (.984) showed that the impact was statistically significant at the 98% confidence level. An increase of 1% on Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach was attributed to 0.899% improvement in Beneficiary Satisfaction and the t-statistic value (2.584) showed that the impact was statistically significant at the 98% confidence level. The regression model provided a statistical control through which the study established the influence of each predictor variable, and hence suggesting that the Project Effectiveness was

exhibited in terms of Logical Framework Approach, Theory based M&E Approach, and Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach. The coefficients for each independent variable were non-zero, which meant that all the independent variables influenced the dependent variables.

Results Discussion

The results on establishing the evaluate the contribution of monitoring and evaluation approaches on the sustainability of projects in Rwanda taking the Sustaining Religious Leaders' Gender Desk initiative Project as the case study concur with the study of (Mutesi, & Odhuno, 2021). Results on determination of M&E approaches used by Sustaining Religious Leaders' Gender Desk initiative project of the project agreed by the reports of MINICOFIN, (2010) noted that monitoring and evaluation approaches is good for assessment of the project performance and organizational learning if are vital. This is similar to the present study indicated that the general conditions of M&E of the project is good (58.7%).

The findings indicated that M&E approach most reported was logical framework approach, therefore, this was in the same vein where logical framework is one of two approaches to conducting daily operations in the real world of management, monitoring and evaluation (Myrick, 2013).

One respondent said *“Logical framework approach is a highly effective strategic planning and project management methodology with wide application. Usually, this approach is combined with other approach to get more concrete results in management”*.

Methodology is the results based on management where by results are compared to the designed target using associated methods.

The findings (Table 1) indicated that RRLI M&E team has implemented the LFA as a management tool for effective planning and implementation of the project (52.2%). This is concurred by Emmett, et al., (2014), argued that the logical framework (or logframe) approach provides a set of designing tools that, when used creatively, can be used for planning, designing, implementing and evaluating projects. Similarly, the current study is agreed with the observation of Smith (2017) reporting that Logframes provide a structured, logical approach to setting priorities and determining the intended results and activities of a project.

Regarding the role of stakeholders, one staff interviewee said: *“the stakeholders are engaged in the project implementation and project evaluation. One female said”*. The findings shown at the rate of 52.2% that RRLI M&E team shares its LFA reports with donors and stakeholders. This concurred by Emmett, et al., (2014), denoted that this LFA should be used to bring the stakeholders together from the national policy level to the resource user level in a single logframe exercise is unlikely to be feasible or productive.

Regarding the LFA adopted by RRLI M&E team that if can provide clear, concise and systematic information about project, one tenant said: *“Yes, because they provide the effort to LFA on the project progress statues”*. One male said. Another interviewee said that *“The LFA has since been adopted as a project planning and management tool by most donors, multilateral and bilateral development agencies”*.

The findings demonstrated that the LFA is adopted by RRLI aids in the monitoring and evaluation of the projects (41.3%) and LFA is used to examine the progress of the project and co-relate the activities carried out and results achieved (46.7%). Therefore, this is result similar to the report done by Gawne et al., (2021), noted that LFA should be considered as a tool to help strengthen project design, implementation and evaluation. The same note given by Gyorkos, (2003), monitoring an

evaluation is crucial part of the management cycle including in planning and design of projects (Gyorkos, 2003).

The findings from (Table 2) regarding theory based M&E and Sustainability of Project indicated that the 33(35.9%) strongly agreed that the Theory based M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team assists in planning and the management by identifying crucial factors of success. Under a half percent was strongly agreed (38%) that the Theory based M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team allows for an in-depth understanding of the program or project is working while 40.2% of respondents agreed that The Theory based M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team helps in deciding which steps to be monitored with the development of the program which enables to determine how they are borne out.

The findings shown in Table 3 indicated that 40(43.5%) of respondents agreed that Rapid Appraisal M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team helps in gathering and analyzing data as well as reporting crucial information meant for key decision makers within a short duration. Thus, this agreement is supported by the Rios, (2017) noticed that monitoring with Rapid Appraisal M&E approach should be undertaken as close to real time as possible. It is also in the same line Townsley, (1996) argued that Appraisal M&E approach is also useful for supporting decisions towards the improvement of sustainability of project systems in developing countries. Similarly, with the findings noted by Makori,(2015) implied that the RA M&E method can help in gathering and analyzing data as well as reporting crucial information meant for key decision makers within a short duration.

Answer to the interviewee, *“the theory based M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team by indicating and understanding in depth of the program”*. One male respondent said. Another respondent said: *“Rapid Appraisal M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team, it helps in rapid gathering of the information and the rapid analysis of data as well as reporting of critical information related to the project and for appropriate decision making”*.

Rapid Appraisal M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team is used to provide a qualitative understanding of the complex socioeconomic changes, contrary, Mutesi and Odhuno, (2021) noted that Rapid Appraisal M&E approach is adopted to prepare and to ensure that potential negative environmental and socioeconomic impacts are identified during project implementation prior to approval of individual components, and that appropriate measures are taken to avoid, minimize and mitigate such negative impacts.

The current study shown that there was a negative correlation and no statistically significant correlation between the theory based M&E approach and logical framework approach (-148 ± 0.160). While there is a strong positive correlation and statistically significant between Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach and Theory based M&E Approach (0.342 ± 0.001). The same way, there is a strong positive correlation and statistically significant between Timely completion of the Project and project effectiveness (0.564 ± 0.000). There is a strong positive correlation and statistically significant between Beneficiary Satisfaction and Theory based M&E Approach (0.644 ± 0.000). This is supported by Crawford & Bryce (2013) noted that a good M&E approach involves beneficiaries in monitoring in order to evaluate their satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

The socio-demographic of respondents were dominated by females; age ranged of adult's people from 36-45 years old, the married people and the education level was bachelor's studies. The findings indicated that the general conditions of M&E of the project are very good whereas the M&E Approaches that has the RRLI project team implemented was logical Framework Approach. The RRLI M&E team has implemented the LFA as a management tool for effective planning and implementation of the project and RRLI M&E team shares its LFA reports with donors and

stakeholders. There was adoption of the Theory based M&E approach by RRLI M&E team allows for an in-depth understanding of the program or project is working. The researcher found that Rapid Appraisal M&E approach adopted by RRLI M&E team is used to provide a qualitative understanding of the complex socioeconomic changes. The findings shown that Project Effectiveness was Extent while Timely completion of the Project was moderated extent and Beneficiary Satisfaction was Extent. The researcher identified the challenges faced RRLI project including insufficient of funds inability to create self-generating income activities, sustainability of program, mismanagement and other not specific challenges. In additional, there was a negative correlation and no statistically significant correlation between the theory based M&E approach and logical framework approach while there is a strong positive correlation and statistically significant between Rapid Appraisal M&E Approach and Theory based M&E Approach. There is also a strong positive correlation and statistically significant between Timely completion of the Project and project effectiveness. The researcher found that there is a strong positive correlation and statistically significant between Beneficiary Satisfaction and Theory based M&E Approach.

Recommendations

To Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and Ministry of gender and family planning

The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the Ministry of Industry should consider the practices of M&E project and support the such project especially in solving the constraints of usually facing the project including insufficient of funds, inability to create self-generating income activities, sustainability of program and mismanagement. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the Ministry of and Industry should establish the policy for M&E project for the reason to facilitate the owners.

To the donors and stakeholders

The donors and stakeholders should invest and support the M&E project to create self-generating income activities to maintain the sustainability of the program.

To future researchers:

The researcher went deeper into the research; more interesting topics came in his way. From the matter, it was suggested that future researchers would research on the following:

To determine the impact of monitoring and evaluation practices on the project relating to community well-fare of rural people in Rwanda.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this research project would not have been possible without the guidance of my able supervisor, Dr. Eugenia Nkechi Irechukwu who took her time to go through the work and make necessary input. I am highly indebted to Mount Kenya University Rwanda members of staff for having provided me with the opportunity to undertake my studies as well as my friends and colleagues whom we travelled the academic journey together. I would like to acknowledge the management and staff team of Rwanda Religious Leaders Initiative (RRLI) in Kicukiro, Gasabo, Musanze, Rubavu and Nyamagabe districts for granting me the opportunity to conduct the study. Special gratitude go to my family, and more so to my wife for her emotional support. God bless you all.

REFERENCES

Angelo, L. E. (2008). Auditor Size and Auditor Quality. *Journal of Accounting & Economics.*,3, PP.183-199.

Baker, N. (2011). *Raising internal audit's potential*. London: Internal Auditors inc.

- Barrett, T., Feola, G., Krylova, V., & Khusnitdinova, M. (2017). The application of Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Innovation Systems (RAAIS) to agricultural adaptation to climate change in Kazakhstan: A critical evaluation. *Agricultural Systems*, 151, 106-113.
- Baum, F., Delany-Crowe, T., MacDougall, C., Van Eyk, H., Lawless, A., Williams, C., & Marmot, M. (2019). To what extent can the activities of the South Australian Health in All Policies initiative be linked to population health outcomes using a program theory-based evaluation?. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 1-16.
- Bretherton, P., Piggin, J., & Bodet, G. (2016). Olympic sport and physical activity promotion: the rise and fall of the London 2012 pre-event mass participation 'legacy'. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 8(4), 609-624.
- Chauvet, L., Collier, P., Fuster, A. (2007). *Supervision and project performance: a principal-agent approach*. London: Mimeo, inc.
- Chen, H. T., Morosanu, L., Powell-Threets, K., Lian, B., & Turner, N. (2019). Assessment of the monitoring and evaluation system of a population-based program: Theory-driven evaluation approach. *Evaluation and program planning*, 77, 101719.
- Conrad IV, J. L., Greene, W. D., & Hiesl, P. (2018). The evolution of logging businesses in Georgia 1987–2017 and South Carolina 2012–2017. *Forest Science*, 64(6), 671-681.
- Duraiappah, A. K. (2017). Linking Science and Policy: Using the Crowd in the Cloud. *Global Change, Ecosystems, Sustainability: Theory, Methods, Practice*, 41.
- Emmett, B., Abdalla, M., Anthony, S., August, T., Barrett, G., Biggs, J. & Wright, S. (2014). Glastir Monitoring & Evaluation Programme. First year annual report.
- Gawne, B., Ryan, K. A., Coleman, M., Meehan, A., Davies, P. E., Sluggett, A. & Mues, C. (2021). Monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management in the Murray–Darling Basin. *Murray-Darling Basin, Australia*, 227-249.
- Guerry, A. D., Polasky, S., Lubchenco, J., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Daily, G. C., Griffin, R. & Vira, B. (2015). Natural capital and ecosystem services informing decisions: From promise to practice. *Proceedings of the National academy of Sciences*, 112(24), 7348-7355.
- Gyorkos, T. W. (2003). Monitoring and evaluation of large scale helminth control programmes. *Acta tropica*, 86(2-3), 275-282.
- Hamisi Jitta, M., John, M., & Charles, R. (2021). Logical Framework and Research Projects Enhancement in Public Universities in the Coast Region of Kenya. *Review Pub Administration Manag*, 9, 289.
- Hassenforder, E., Ducrot, R., Ferrand, N., Barreteau, O., Daniell, K. A., & Pittock, J. (2016). Four challenges in selecting and implementing methods to monitor and evaluate participatory processes: example from the Rwenzori region, Uganda. *Journal of environmental management*, 180, 504-516.
- Janker, J., & Thieme, S. (2021). Migration and justice in the era of sustainable development goals: a conceptual framework. *Sustainability science*, 1-15.
- Jennings, J. E., Breitkreuz, R. S., & James, A. E. (2013). When family members are also business owners: Is entrepreneurship good for families?. *Family Relations*, 62(3), 472-489.
- Kananura, R. M., Ekirapa-Kiracho, E., Paina, L., Bumba, A., Mulekwa, G., Nakiganda-Busiku, D. & Peters, D. H. (2017). Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence

- decision-making: lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health research policy and systems*, 15(2), 55-68.
- Kukutai, T., Thompson, V., & McMillan, R. (2015). Whither the census? Continuity and change in census methodologies worldwide, 1985–2014. *Journal of Population Research*, 32(1), 3-22.
- Mahjoury, N., & Ardestani, M. (2010). A game theoretic approach for interbasin water resources allocation considering the water quality issues. *Environmental monitoring and assessment*, 167(1), 527-544.
- Makori, V. K. (2015). *Effective Approaches of Monitoring Results–Based Financing Project* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- McDonald, S., Turner, T., Chamberlain, C., Lumbiganon, P., Thinkhamrop, J., Festin, M. R. & Green, S. (2010). Building capacity for evidence generation, synthesis and implementation to improve the care of mothers and babies in South East Asia: methods and design of the SEA-ORCHID Project using a logical framework approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 10(1), 1-10.
- McKinnon, M. C., & Hole, D. G. (2015). Exploring Program Theory to Enhance Monitoring and Evaluation in Ecosystem-Based Adaptation Projects. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2015(147), 49-60.
- Mero, F. (2019). Assessment of Factors Influencing the Success of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for Local NGO's in Mwananyamala Ward: The Case of PACT Tanzania (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
- Mgoba, S. A. (2019). *Effectiveness of participatory monitoring and evaluation on achievement of community-based water projects in Chamwino District, Tanzania* (Doctoral dissertation, Sokoine University of Agriculture).
- Mualuko, BW, Mbabazi, M., & Shukla, J. (2016). Effect of Self-Help Groups Activities on Women Empowerment in Rwanda: A Case of Twisungane Women's Self Help Group. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 4 (1), 1-16.
- Mureithi, J. M. (2015). Factors influencing the use of monitoring and evaluation systems of public projects in Nakuru county (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Muscio, A., Reid, A., & Rivera Leon, L. (2015). An empirical test of the regional innovation paradox: can smart specialisation overcome the paradox in Central and Eastern Europe?. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, 18(2), 153-171.
- Mutesi, J., & Odhuno, E. (2021). Impact of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices on Compliance at Rwanda's Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project. *Journal of Economics*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Myrick, D. (2013). A logical framework for monitoring and evaluation: a pragmatic approach to M&E. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 423.
- Ojwang, W. O., & Bwisa, H. M. (2014). Role of Participatory Management in the Sustainability of Constituency Development Fund Projects: A Case Study of Maragua Constituency. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(10), 108.
- Park, J. M., Park, J. Y., & Park, H. S. (2016). A review of the National Eco-Industrial Park Development Program in Korea: Progress and achievements in the first phase, 2005–2010. *Journal of cleaner production*, 114, 33-44.
- Radunovic, M. (2020). Achieving small hydropower plant projects sustainability by implementing Logical Framework Approach. *Industrija*, 48(1), 61-79.

- Rios, O. (2017). *A monitoring and evaluation framework for South-South Cooperation*. South African Institute of International Affairs.
- Russo, F., Iiritano, G., Pellicanò, D. S., Petrunaro, G., & Zito, C. (2020). Logical framework approach to Calabria sustainable development: the intervention program on school buildings. *Journal homepage: <http://iieta.org/journals/ijssse>, 10(2), 235-241.*
- Townsley, P. (1996). *Rapid rural appraisal, participatory rural appraisal and aquaculture* (No. 358). Food & Agriculture Org.
- Yamaswari, I. A. C., Kazbekov, J., Lautze, J., & Wegerich, K. (2016). Sleeping with the enemy? Capturing internal risks in the logical framework of a water management project. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 32(1), 116-134.

