

International Journal of Culture and Religious Studies

(IJCRS)

What is the relationship between evaluation and performance of
Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese?



CARI
Journals

What is the relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese?

By

Duncan Katimbo

Post Graduate Student: Uganda Technology and Management University

Corresponding Author's Email: katimbod@gmail.com

Assoc. Prof. John Micheal Maxel Okoche

Lecturer and Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Uganda Technology and Management University (UTAMU)

Abstract

Purpose: Evaluation as a good management practice and an integral function of the project life cycle improves project performance (Shapiro, 2007; Nyonje et al, 2012; Shelber, 2014). The Church of Uganda planned various evaluations to determine the performance of the strategic plan 2025. This paper examined the relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese.

Methodology: A Cross sectional survey design was used on a study population of 117 respondents. 87 respondents filled the Survey questionnaires whose responses were analysed by using correlational and regression analysis by using **PSPP software Version 1.2.0-g0fb4db**. Key Informant interviews and an FGD were carried out and responses were analysed using content analysis and results presented as text. The empirical results were presented in frequencies, percentages and summarized into tables.

Findings: Descriptive findings highlighted that evaluation to some extent improves project performance (**mean 3.1**), This was further supported by the qualitative findings. However, inferential statistics revealed that evaluation had a non-significant positive relationship with Project performance (**$\beta=0.17$, $p= 0.188>0.05$**).

Unique contribution to theory, practice and policy: In conclusion, this paper established that evaluation to some extent influences project performance. The weaknesses included; having impromptu evaluations of what has not been monitored, lack of evaluation skills and knowledge, lack of commitment from staff, lack of allegiance to the Diocese and only local parish focus, lack of having set Key performance indicators (KPIs) and baseline information. Therefore, to improve upon the performance of Church of Uganda projects, it is important to strengthen the evaluation mechanisms; baseline evaluation, mid-term evaluation and end-term evaluation. The non-existent evaluation framework will be developed with informed decisions from the study.

Keywords: *Evaluation, Performance, Church of Uganda, Diocese*

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

OECD/DAC, 2019 defines Evaluation as; The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Depending on the purpose and timing of the project different evaluations can be carried out explained below; Ex-ante: An evaluation that is performed before implementation of a development intervention, Mid-term: Evaluation performed towards the middle of the period of implementation of the intervention, End-term: A study conducted at the end of an intervention to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. it is intended to provide information about the worth of the program. Evaluation as a rigorous and independent assessment of either completed or ongoing activities measures how well program activities have met objectives UNDP, 2009 as mentioned in Mbithi & Kiruja, 2015 and also Evaluation helps to establish what difference is being made, why the level of performance is being achieved, what is being learned from activities, and whether and how to strengthen implementation of a programme or policy (Goldman and Porter, 2013). Some of the functions of Evaluation include; to strengthen accountability; to stimulate learning and improved performance across the partnership; and to facilitate organizational decision- making (Global Partnership for Education (GPE) strategic plan, 2017; Larsen and Boodooh 2019). Edmunds & Marchant, 2008 as mentioned in Kabeyi, 2019 indicate that traditional evaluation used to focus on inputs and implementation but currently the shift is towards the contribution of interventions and hence evaluation focuses on the benefits side of the project rather than the cost side to show the extent to which the project objectives were achieved. Further still, Harold, 2013 in Ochenge Maendo et al, 2018 showed that knowledge about project evaluation helps project contractors and managers to effectively evaluate the infrastructure projects and therefore improve the performance of the

projects. This is evident and shows clarity about the relationship between evaluation and project performance.

Measuring and managing performance is a challenging enterprise and seen as one of the keys to managing change and thus gaining competitive advantage in organizations (Neely, 2004; Quezada, 2005). Globally, the OECD/DAC criteria is followed to evaluate the project performance as already indicated in the definition above but a brief understanding of each aspect is provided by OECD; Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?, Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?, Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?, Efficiency: How well are the resources being used? Impact: What difference does the intervention make?, Sustainability: Will the benefits last?

The previous evaluation questions offer so many advantages and hence making evaluation useful; Help make resource allocation Decisions, Help rethink the causes of the problem, Identify emerging problems, Support decision-making on competing or Best alternatives, Support Public sector reform and innovation, (Kusek and Rist, 2004).

During the baseline evaluation an assessment is carried out to provide a platform to think about the thinking of the managers, designers, programmers before the implementation. Considering the stated objectives and their initial status, implementation plan, Budget, basically ensuring that nothing wrong has been incorporated. This then leads us to the implementation phase which many managers do not sometimes scrutinize but look at the beginning, monitor and then wait for the expected outcomes and evaluate at the end and yet a lot can happen during the implementation to what started well. Evaluating implementation phase happens at the middle of the project life cycle and the focus of process implementation evaluation is on implementation details and this provides chance to managers to fully understand why things are not working efficiently and effectively and hence providing a confident platform for initiating needed countermeasures. Unlike Mid-term evaluation which provides information during the learning of the project, end-term evaluation provides information at the end of learning (Janus et al, 2010).

In the Church the current concept of evaluation has been accepted and even budgeted for, the COU included a monitoring and evaluation strategy in its strategic plan and even internationally small portions of the entire budget are set aside for the purpose of evaluation (Cupitt et al, 2014). They further revealed that most Church projects collect some project data and outcomes data but that evaluation is limited within the projects. This was included in the strategic plan at the higher level but the question to ask is whether what was planned was implemented, did the various set evaluations (baseline, mid-term and end-term) take place both at the provincial and the related 37 dioceses in the Church of Uganda? This is where Kirogo, 2020 stresses that "It is crucial for the

implementers to make sure proper planning for M&E, the stakeholders involved have the competency required and the M&E results are utilised to better the program”. The UFE approach in this study agrees with that notion hence making the study a participatory one in order to aim for betterment of the user. This therefore ensures that evaluation as a culture will grow in the intended organization.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

1.2.1 Utilisation Focused Evaluation Theory (UFE)

Evaluands exist with theories behind them, governing them, several theoretical approaches have been designed depending on purpose and need of the evaluation; Theory-driven (Chen, 2015), Values-Engaged Evaluation (Green, 2011); Empowerment evaluation (Fetterman, 2012) and Utilisation-Focused Evaluation (UFE) (Patton, 2002). Historical context of the UFE is provided by Moleko, 2011 who carried out a study “Influence and originality in Michael Quinn Patton’s Utilization-Focused Evaluation” and mentions that in coming up with the definition of Evaluation research, Patton first mentions it in his 1978 edition of “Utilisation-focused Evaluation” and it evolves three times to the 1986 edition. The 1978 Patton’s definition stated that “Evaluation research is the systematic collection of information about the activities and outcomes of actual programs in order for interested persons to make judgments about specific aspects of what the program is doing and affecting”. Moleko further explains that the definition’s focus on the respondent’s reactions which is what gave Patton the basis of the notion of Utilisation-focused evaluation. Utilisation-Focused Evaluation (UFE) highly described by Patton, 2002; “that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use, and only when the end goal is for discrete decision making plus the intended use should be by primary stakeholders. Primary stakeholders are the high-level stakeholders in the program who are directly concerned with the evaluation results. Their input must be sought at all stages of the evaluation, the evaluator is expected to engage them with the intention of getting them to accept why the evaluation is being done and most importantly using the results to reprogram. The primary stakeholders are further split into their functional lines of work where they can confidently comment of any investigated matter. Patton, 2012 further says that “the Intended users are more likely to use the evaluation if they feel ownership of the process and its results. Use does not happen naturally” To supplement this, Patton, 2013 came up with a list of 17 steps to be followed when carrying out a UFE. King and Stevahn (2013) confirm that interaction amongst evaluation stakeholders leads to an effective evaluation.

The critical importance of this theory to this study is that it provides the frame work for incorporating the intended users of the research findings. This implies that the researcher will

involve the users at all stages of the research and hence this theory affects the nature of the methodology. This theory provides this study with a linkage between the evaluation and the Church policies and strategic plan, it enables the research to answer the question, “so what after presenting the findings”. This is because the aim of the Church’s strategic evaluation strategy is to improve the strategic plan, policies and other practices on behalf of the Christians (Weiss 1999). Evidence is produced by the evaluators however, this evidence requires interpretation which is best done by the program implementers hence utilisation focused evaluation comes in at this point. The primary intended users of the evaluation must decide what kind of evidence they need and must weigh the evidence to determine the extent to which the preponderance of evidence supports a conclusion of contribution (Patton, 2015).

From the onset of the definition of the theory there lies in the limitations. Patton, 2002, Utilization-focused evaluation does not advocate any particular evaluation content, model, method, theory, or even use. Rather, it is a process for helping primary intended users select the most appropriate. The nature of this theory is to work together with the intended users, which might be time consuming because you can not move to the next stage until all have understood the current state of your research which is a critical limitation in that it again affects the study at the end of it all, the findings must be shared for decision making. Therefore the intended users must be part of the process from the start to the end which requires delicate and comprehensive involvement.

2 METHODS

2.1 Study Design

A cross-sectional survey design was used after having observed how it was used by related studies from the literature review (Odhiambo, Wakibia & Sakwa, 2020 ,Bazira, 2017) using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The characteristics of Cross-sectional design are that it is used to investigate a population and be able to carry out sampling and studying a single group in one instance which is what was needed in this study. It was also advantageous to the study that it helped the researcher to use the data collected to infer to the rest of the population and also study multiple variables at a single moment. This implies that cross-sectional design enabled this study to examine the influence of the independent variable (evaluation) on project performance.

2.2 Study Population

The study population steamed from Namirembe Diocese which is one of the 37 dioceses in the province of the Church of Uganda. Namirembe Diocese as the case study area consisted of 7

Archdeaconries each led by an Archdeacon which were subdivided into a total of 61 Parishes each having a parish priest, estates officer and a Lay Leader (Head of Laity). Namirembe Diocese had a Diocesan office for overall administrative purposes with different departments but most importantly the Estates Department as the unit of analysis of this study.

2.3 Sample size

The primary purpose of sampling for a qualitative researcher is to collect specific cases, events, or actions that can clarify or deepen the researchers understanding about the phenomenon under study (Mohd Ishak & Abu Bakar, 2014). In order to determine the sample size, all the seven Archdeaconries were considered, which provided us with a total of 61 Parishes in Namirembe Diocese. Under each Parish we considered a Parish Priest, an Estate Officer and the Lay Leader (Head of Laity), as indicated in the table below, each gets a population of 61 with a sample of only 39 respondents as per the percentage of the population and the Morgan & Krejcie tables. In case the Estates Officer and the Head of Laity were not available we considered any other congregant or Parishioner with a reasonable number of years and experience at that Parish. A population of 10 key informants were considered with a sample of only 6 respondents as per the percentage of the population and the Morgan tables. The Key Informants were mainly the Archdeacons and other Key people with experience in the Church matters and reasonable number of years of Church service. An intended Focus Group Discussion was considered at the Diocesan Level with a population of 15 and a sample size of 10 as per the percentage of the population and the Morgan and Krejcie tables.

2.4 Sampling techniques and procedures

This study followed Convenient sampling, Purposive sampling and Stratified random sampling in order to have a comprehensive representation. Convenient Sampling was used to choose the most accessible diocese in terms of distance, budget and time constraints and well published statistics (Anol, 2012). This technique falls under the non-probabilistic methods of sampling. Therefore, Namirembe diocese was conveniently sampled. Following that, through Stratified Random sampling we selected the Estate officers, Lay Leaders and Parish Priests. The Key informants were selected purposively due to the characteristics described above and similarly the FGD participants from the Diocesan office.

2.5 Data collection Methods

The primary data collection methods included; Surveys, Key Informant Interviews and Focus group discussions which were scheduled to capture information based on the objectives of the

study. During the Survey method, the questionnaires were issued to the 117 respondents using the online questionnaire, phone interviews and lastly by delivering hard copies. All these methods were interchanged depending on the respondents convenience and the current COVID - 19 Standard Operating Procedures. The second method was the Key Informant Interview, whereby the interviews were carried out with the interviewees that possessed the special characteristics as required by the study. Lastly, a focus group discussion was held at the diocesan office with a selected team in order to discuss the findings and also to acquire the possible insights from each discussant.

2.6 Data collection instruments

The data collection instruments that were employed in this research included; Under the Survey method: Structured questionnaire, Online google form. For quantitative data capture in the survey questionnaire, a Likert scale was used as suggested by Tukei et al, 2016; a 5 rate and coded Likert Scale (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Not sure, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree) for measurement of variables and cites these advantages that it both categorises and ranks the elements into some order. Under the Key Informant Interviews (KII) we used the Key informant Interview guide, and for the Focus Group Discussions we used the Focus Group Discussion guide.

2.7 Procedure of Data Collection

The designed questionnaires were sent out for primary data collection to the identified respondents at the diocesan offices and to the various archdeaconries. Respondents were contacted to share their whatsapp phone numbers or the emails onto which a google form link was sent to enable them to fill in remotely. Some of the respondents preferred hard copies and therefore they were delivered to them and returned to the researcher. The respondents were called by phone in advance to ask them to complete the questionnaires when they arrive and then reminders were sent out on the second week. This was followed by carrying out interviews with the selected key informants. Most of the informants preferred face to face interviews and therefore they were engaged in deep discussions. The KII was one of the ways to ensure the purpose of the Utilisation Focused Evaluation Theory. Finally, a Focus Group Discussion was held at the Diocesan office comprising of the Estates department unit members and then the senior management as was guided by the office of the Diocesan Secretary. FGD further strengthens the fact that this study was guided by the Utilisation Focused Evaluation theory (UFE) whereby the diocesan management participates and owns the findings which are utilised to inform policy and cause change where possible.

2.8 Data Analysis

Richard, 2012; Tukei, 2016 defines data analysis as a process in which raw data is ordered and organized, modeled and transformed into useful information. In this research there was both qualitative and quantitative data that required different approaches of analysis. For quantitative data, by using PSPP software closed-ended questionnaires were edited, coded and then summarized the data into frequencies, percentages and later into tables. This study borrowed what was used by Tukei et al, 2016 in his study of Risk analysis and staff performance; Pearson product Moment correlations were used to determine the relationship between Evaluation and Project performance. Then regression analysis was carried out to determine the significance of evaluation in the above relationship. For qualitative data, there was need to reduce (code, categorise into meaningful themes) what felt like an overwhelming amount of data collected from Interviews and FGD recorded notes. These findings were purposefully used to substantiate findings from quantitative data (Wamuntu, 2017). The independent variable (evaluation) was measured by the average of the three dimensions which included; baseline evaluation, mid-term evaluation and end-term evaluation. Then the dependent variable (project performance) was measured by the average of its six (6) dimensions which included; Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. As earlier mentioned in the design of the questionnaire, the rate and scale that was used was the one suggested by Tukei et al, 2016 a 5 rate and coded Likert Scale (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Not sure, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree) for measurement of both the IV. Finally as earlier explained in the data analysis section the relationships between the variables were determined by Pearson correlation analysis, Regression analysis and Multiple regression analysis. The empirical results were presented in frequencies, percentages and summarized into tables.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Response Rate

When the researcher distributed the questionnaires, organised interviews and arranged the Focus group discussion a certain number of respondents was proposed and hence expected to show up or send their filled questionnaires. However, due to different reasons some of the respondents did not show up or send their replies, therefore by simple mathematics the response rate was got by dividing the total number of received respondents by the proposed number of respondents and the result of that is multiplied by 100 in order to represent the response rate as a percentage. The existing literature presents to us with different minimum response rate values; 75% by Sekaran, 2003 in Apajo, 2016, Luutu, 2015; Bazira, 2017, 55.6% by Kabuye, 2016; Bazira, 2017.

Table 1: Response Rate

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Returned	87	74
Unreturned	30	26
Total	117	100

Source: Primary data

At the on set of the study the researcher planned a sample of 117 however, only 87 returned the questionnaires thereby having a response rate of 74% (26 parish priests, 14 Estates officers, 9 Lay leaders, 38 other long serving respondents that were used as proxies to the Estates officers and Lay leaders). There were planned Key Informant Interviews and a diocesan Focus Group Discussion, which were carried out as planned. The obtained response rate of 74% was valid which enabled the study to continue with the data analysis since it was within the range of the provided response rates from the discussed scholars above.

3.2 Background Characteristics of Respondents

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents in reference to period of service with Namirembe Diocese, age distribution of the respondents and the education level of the respondents. This ensures the representativeness of the research findings

Table 2: Background Characteristics Of Respondents

Variable	Dimensions	Frequency	Percentage
Period of Service	5-9years	19	22%
	>10years	36	41%
Age Distribution	29years and below	6	7%
	>30years	71	82%
Education Level	Ordinary Diploma	7	8%
	First Degree and above	68	78%

Source: Primary data

The study findings show that the majority (63%) of the respondents have served in the Church for more than 5 years, where 22% have served for 5-9years and 41% have served for more than 10 years. In this study this implies that a respondent who has served for 5 years and above is likely to understand the performance of Church projects.

More to that the study findings show that majority of the respondents (82%) of the respondents were more than 30years of age and only 7% were 29years and below. This suggests that majority of the workers in the Church have gathered enough experience to understand project performance and monitoring and evaluation.

In addition to the above the study findings further show that majority (78%) of the respondents have at least attained their first Bachelors Degree and above and only 8% had attained an ordinary Diploma. Therefore majority of the Church staff are fairly educated. As for this study, this implies that the sample is well representative of the education characteristics since some have attained from as low as Ordinary diploma and as High as Doctorate Degree level. Hence, the responses achieved were of high quality.

3.3 The relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics On Evaluation And Project Performance

EVALUATION	SD	D	NS	A	SA	MEAN	ST.DEV
Baseline evaluation influences project performance	01% (01)	08% (07)	20% (17)	52% (45)	19% (17)	3.8	0.89
Mid-term evaluation influences project performance	02% (02)	09% (08)	24% (21)	46% (40)	18% (16)	3.69	0.96
End-term evaluation influences project performance	02% (02)	12% (10)	14% (12)	55% (48)	17% (15)	3.74	0.96
We conduct Baseline evaluations in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects	04% (03)	24% (21)	40% (35)	25% (22)	07% (06)	3.08	0.96
We undertake Mid-term evaluations in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects	05% (05)	21% (18)	45% (39)	29% (25)	0% (0)	2.97	0.86
We conduct End-term evaluations in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects	03% (03)	20% (17)	36% (31)	37% (32)	04% (04)	3.2	0.93
N=87, Mean of means =						3.1	

Source: Primary data

The descriptive findings in relation to influence of baseline evaluation on project performance established that 19% strongly agreed, 52% agreed, 20% were not sure, 8% disagreed and 1% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlights that 71% agreed, while 9% disagreed with a mean of 3.8 and standard deviation of 0.89 were achieved which implies that majority of the respondents agreed to the statement that baseline evaluation influences project performance. The

qualitative findings also supported the findings, one of the key informant highlighted in his own assessment that “the baselines facilitate the establishment of the preliminary information which is critical for assessment of the project performance. The baseline studies guide the subsequent assessment as it provides a base for determination of good or poor performance”.

In addition to that, the findings in relation to influence of midterm evaluation on project performance established that 18% strongly agreed, 46% agreed, 24% were not sure, 9% disagreed and 2% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlights that 64% of the respondents agreed and 11% disagreed with a mean of 3.69 and standard deviation of 0.96 were achieved which implies that most of the respondents agreed to the statement that mid-term evaluation influences project performance.

Further to that, the findings of the study in relation to influence of end-term evaluation on project performance established that 17% strongly agreed, 55% agreed, 14% were not sure, 12% disagreed and 2% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlights that 72% agreed and 14% disagreed with a mean of 3.74 and standard deviation of 0.96 were obtained which implies that most of the respondents agreed to the statement that end-term evaluation influences project performance.

More still, the study findings in relation to conducting baseline evaluations in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda projects established that 7% strongly agreed, 25% agreed, 40% were not sure, 24% disagreed and 4% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 32% agreed and 28% disagreed with a mean of 3.08 which was very close to not sure and a standard deviation of 0.96 were achieved which implies that very few of the respondents agreed that baseline evaluations are undertaken in Namirembe Diocese. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, it was highlighted in the FGD that “there is no evaluation frame work, the whole institution cannot progress without planning, and good planning which involves baseline evaluations can only be done if M&E systems exists from which Key Performance Indicators (KPI), Targets are extracted.

The key informant further stressed that “The outcomes expected are not known because there were no set KPI’s and even no baseline information onto which objectives can be evaluated”.

It was confirmed from the descriptive findings in relation to undertaking mid-term evaluations in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects that 0% strongly agreed, 29% agreed, 45% were not sure, 21% disagreed and 5% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 29% agreed and 26% disagreed with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 0.86 were achieved which implies that few of the respondents agreed that mid-term evaluations are undertaken in

Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, one of the key informant highlighted in his own assessment that “Evaluation is not being done, this is because it is not in place not until a problem arises and management then wants to do an evaluation of what was not monitored”.

Lastly, the descriptive findings in relation to conducting end-term evaluations in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects established that 4% strongly agreed, 37% agreed, 36% were not sure, 20% disagreed and 3% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 41% agreed and 23% disagreed with a mean of 3.2 which was very close to not sure and a standard deviation of 0.93 were achieved which implies that few of the respondents agreed that end-term evaluations are undertaken in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects.

The mean of means indicating the actual evaluation situation in Namirembe Diocese was 3.1 which was very close to 3 or “Not Sure” on the Likert Scale. This implied that the evaluation dimensions; Baseline evaluation, Mid-term Evaluation and End-term Evaluation of the Church of Uganda projects were not well defined at Namirembe Diocese. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, in the FGD it was highlighted by one of the discussants that “Because we do not have an Evaluation framework in the Diocese, we cannot even know our Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. This is because M&E usually exposes the real status of the organisation. Since the Frame work doesnot exist at the top to trickle down to the lower levels that is why we even do fire fighting “evaluating only when there is a crisis”.

3.4 Correlation results between Evaluation and project performance

In this Study we carried out the Pearson correlation analysis in order to establish the direction of the relationship between the independent variable, Evaluation and the dependent variable, project performance of the Church of Uganda projects Namirembe Diocese. The results of the correlation coefficient (r) and the significance level (p) are displayed in the table below;

Table 4: Correlation Results Between Evaluation And Project Performance

		Monitoring	Evaluation	Project Performance
Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	0.68	1	0.40
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.000
	N	87	87	87

The study shows that there is a significant but moderate positive linear relationship between evaluation and project performance of Namirembe Diocese ($r=0.40$, $P=0.000$, <0.05) which implies that for any change in evaluation of project activities there is a moderate change in project performance. It was noted that evaluation had the lesser correlation coefficient than monitoring, therefore it is of less effect in this relationship than monitoring.

3.5 Regression relationship between Evaluation and project performance

Regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between evaluation and project performance and to predict the actual value of the dependent variable, project performance by using evaluation as the independent variable. The study was guided by the hypothesis below;

H_{01} = *There is no significant positive relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda projects.*

H_{A1} = *There is a significant positive relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda projects.*

The results of the regression are shown in the table below;

Table 5: The Evaluation Regression Analysis Results

	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Monitoring	0.17	0.13	0.17		1.33	0.188

Source: Primary Data

The above regression findings revealed that evaluation had a non-significant positive relationship with Project performance in Church of Uganda Namirembe Diocese (Sig =0.188 and an Unstandardised B Coefficient of 0.17). This implies that a unit increase in evaluation results in 0.17 increase in the performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese. Consequently, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant positive relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda projects was accepted and the alternate hypothesis was rejected.

3.6 Discussion

Results from the Pearson Correlation ($r=0.40$, $P=0.000$, <0.05) revealed a moderate positive linear correlation that was statistically significant between evaluation and performance of Namirembe Diocese. This implied that any small change in evaluation would result in a corresponding change in the performance of Church of Uganda projects in Namirembe Diocese. Upon regression, Evaluation had a non-significant positive relationship ($\beta=0.17$, $P=0.188>0.05$) with project performance in Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese. We therefore reject the hypothesis which stated that there is significant positive relationship between evaluation and performance of Church of Uganda projects. The positive relationship is confirmed by the results of the Key informant interviews where it is agreed that evaluation influences project performance and that the minimal success that is achieved is because *“Normally the Archdeacons receive information from the various projects during the managerial meetings and assess them but also the Archdeacons visit some of the projects and at the end seat and carry out assessments”*. This implies that there are some deviations from the planned results that are identified early enough and then new strategies are laid down to improve or stop that particular project component and focus is transferred to the components that were moving in the right direction of the planned targets. This positive linear relationship between evaluation and project performance implies that evaluation is one of the key components whose function cannot be overlooked and this was expanded by Global Partnership for Education (GPE) strategic plan, 2017; Larsen and Boodooh 2019 that “Some of the functions of Evaluation include; to strengthen accountability; to stimulate learning and improved performance; and to facilitate organizational decision-making. Clearly these functions are what is needed by the diocese of Namirembe to improve her projects performance because it requires all administrative levels to be accountable to the higher management levels and that from the past projects lessons can be deduced to improve on the performance of the current and future projects and what follows this is having informed decision making at the diocesan level. The findings of this study about the relationship of evaluation and project performance are further confirmed by Harold, 2013 in Ochenge Maendo et al, 2018 who explain that knowledge about project evaluation helps project contractors and managers to effectively evaluate the infrastructure projects and therefore improve the performance of the projects. In addition to that the findings further converge with the reviewed literature in the way of stressing the importance of evaluation in the project life cycle by showing how the different types of evaluation (baseline evaluation, mid-term evaluation, end-term evaluation) are utilised. Baseline evaluations provide information at the start of projects and the other uses are provided by Janus et al, 2010 that “Unlike Mid-term evaluation which provides information during the learning of the project, end-term evaluation provides information at the end of learning.

Further still, from the findings the mean of means (3.1) shows a poor appreciation of the evaluation framework at Namirembe Diocese. The reason for this result as confirmed from the interviews is that *“Evaluation is not being done, this is because it is not in place not until a problem arises and management then wants to do an evaluation of what was not monitored”*. Impromptu evaluations are not necessarily wrong and perhaps they are not inevitable because of the dynamic nature of projects and top management needs but it is not good to implement a project and it progresses without clear intention to evaluate at some point as already mentioned management sometimes wants to evaluate what has not been monitored. The different evaluations including baseline, mid-term and end-term require a professional who understands their requirements and purpose however it was revealed that *majority of the assigned personnel at Namirembe Diocese lack evaluation skills and Knowledge*. In addition to that midterm and endterm evaluations can only be done well if there is good data that is captured for further analysis but it was revealed that *“The information provided to carry out evaluations is at times not right and hence the results of the assessments cannot be right”*. This is a sign of lack of commitment to carry out Evaluations, *as it was also discovered that some parish priests do not pay much attention to Diocesan level projects but rather on local parish level projects*. This was further confirmed by the key informants that *“The outcomes expected are not known because there were no set Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) and even no baseline information onto which objectives can be evaluated*.

3.7 Conclusion

Evaluation had a non-significant positive relationship ($\beta=0.17$, $P=0.188>0.05$) with project performance in Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese. The positive nature of the relationship shows that there is some influence but not-significant as per the P -value. The study confirms that, improving baseline evaluations, mid-term evaluations and end-term evaluations is likely to improve the performance of Church of Uganda projects in Namirembe Diocese. The weakness of the relationship was caused by general weakness through the three areas of baseline evaluations, Mid-term evaluations and End-term evaluations; having impromptu evaluations of what has not been monitored, lack of evaluation skills and knowledge, lack of commitment from staff, lack of allegiance to the Diocese and only local parish focus, lack of having set Key performance indicators (KPIs) and baseline information. Hence, there should be improvement in those three dimensions in order to have a well defined evaluation framework in Namirembe Diocese. The Church of Uganda should adhere to the basic principles of evaluation if substantial project performance is to be achieved.

3.8 Recommendations

Firstly, the Church should set up the Evaluation framework and Systems to be followed by the entire diocese to ensure accountability and learning during the project life cycle.

Baseline evaluations should be incorporated within all Church projects to ensure that relevant information about all indicators is captured and baseline information should be published and specifically shared with the project implementors for them to know the basis of any specific future evaluation.

The Church should always have midterm evaluations that will guide on any changes that could be either on resources or methods in order to improve on project performance.

End-term evaluations should be planned for in order to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced and to know the worth of the project. If project implementers know that they will be evaluated at the end, they will be motivated to work and hence improve the performance.

References

- Amin, M. E. (2005). *Social science research: Conception, methodology and analysis*. Kampala, Makerere University Press.
- Apajo, J. (2016). *Decentralized Policy Management and Performance of Water and Sanitation Development Facility-North, Lango Sub-Region, in Northern Uganda*. September. https://utamu.ac.ug/docs/research/studentresearch/masters/dissertations/DECENTRALIZED_POLICY_MANAGEMENT_AND_PERFORMANCE.pdf
- Bazira, D. (2017). *Organizational Learning Culture and Utilization of Evaluation Results By International Development Agencies. a Case Study of Heifer International Uganda*. <https://utamu.ac.ug/docs/research/studentresearch/masters/dissertations/DanBazira.pdf>
- Chen, H. T. (2015). *Practical program evaluation (2e éd.)*. Thousand Oaks, É. U.: Sage.
- Cupitt et al. (2014). *An evaluation of the Funding Programme for Mission Opportunities in New Housing and other Development Areas*. May. <http://www.chester.anglican.org/content/pages/documents/1536846532.pdf>
- Dahler-Larsen, P., & Boodhoo, A. (2019). Evaluation culture and good governance: Is there a link?. *Evaluation*, 25(3), 277-293.

- Edmunds & Marchant, T. (2008). Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21). Retrieved from <https://paris21.org/sites/default/files/3638.pdf>
- Fetterman, D. M. (2012). Empowerment evaluation. *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice*, 92.
- Government of Uganda. (2008). National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES): FY2007-08 Bi-annual Implementation Progress Report. <https://www.jlos.go.ug/index.php/document-centre/monitoring-and-evaluation/plans-frameworks-and-strategies/157-national-integrated-monitoring-and-evaluation-strategy-nimes/file>
- Government of Uganda. (2013). Office of the Prime Minister National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation. https://usalearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Attachment_J.15-M&E_Policy_Final_Draft.pdf
- Green, J., Bouce, A., & Ahn, J. (2011). A values-engaged, educative approach for evaluating education programs: A guidebook for practice.
- Harold K. (2013). *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling* (8th Ed. ed.). Wiley. ISBN 0-471-22577-0.
- Janus et al. (2010). Evaluating Early Childhood Education and Care Programs. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://research-repository.uwa.edu.au/en/publications/evaluating-early-childhood-education-and-care-programs>
- Kabuye, J. (2016) Institutional design and Utilisation of evaluation results in Uganda`s public universities: A case study of Kyambogo University, (Master`s Degree Dissertation, Uganda Technology & Management University, 2016). Retrieved from <http://utamu.ac.ug/research-publications/student-research/1234-masters-proposals-dissertations>
- King, J. A., & Stevahn, L. (2013). *Interactive Evaluation Practice: Mastering the Interpersonal Dynamics of Program Evaluation*. Los Angeles: Sage. 431 pages. Available in paperback (ISBN 978-0-7619-2673-3).
- Kirogo, M. P. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices on Performance of Church and Community Mobilization Programme.

[http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/153155/Mwari_Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices on Performance of Church and Community Mobilization Programme - a Case of the Anglican Church of Kenya.pdf?sequence=1](http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/153155/Mwari_Influence_of_Monitoring_and_Evaluation_Practices_on_Performance_of_Church_and_Community_Mobilization_Programme_-_a_Case_of_the_Anglican_Church_of_Kenya.pdf?sequence=1)

Kissi, E., Agyekum, K., Baiden, B. K., Tannor, R. A., Asamoah, G. E., & Andam, E. T. (2019). Impact of project monitoring and evaluation practices on construction project success criteria in Ghana. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/BEPAM-11-2018-0135>

Kusek, Z. J. and Rist, R. C. (2004). *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System. A Handbook for Development Practitioners.* <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/14926> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.”

Luutu, P. (2016) *Participatory evaluation and Utilisation of evaluation results in CBOs: A case study of Share an Opportunity Uganda*, (Master’s Degree Dissertation, Uganda Technology & Management University, 2016). Retrieved from <http://utamu.ac.ug/research-publications/student-research/1234-masters-proposals-dissertations>

Mbithi, V., & Kiruja, I. &dr E. (2015). Role of Monitoring and Evaluation on Performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya: a Case of Kenya Meat Commission. *International Journal of Innovative Development & Policy Studies*, 3(3), 12–27. <http://seahipaj.org/journals-ci/sept-2015/IJIDPS/full/IJIDPS-S-2-2015.pdf>

Mohd Ishak, N., & Abu Bakar, A. Y. (2014). Developing Sampling Frame for Case Study: Challenges and Conditions. *World Journal of Education*, 4(3), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v4n3p29>

Moleko, M. P. (2011). Influence and originality in Michael Quinn Patton ’ s Utilization-Focused Evaluation (Issue March) [University of Stellenbosch]. <http://scholar.sun.ac.za/handle/10019.1/6711>

Neely, A.D. (2004). *Business performance measurement. Theory and Practice.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

NewYork. John Wiley and Sons.

Ochenge Maendo, D., James, R., & Kamau, L. (2018). Effect of Project Monitoring and Evaluation on Performance of Road Infrastructure Projects Constructed By Local Firms in Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 2(04),

317–328. [https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/18856/Effect of Project Monitoring and Evaluation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/18856/Effect_of_Project_Monitoring_and_Evaluation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

Odhiambo, J. O., Wakibia, J., & Sakwa, M. M. (2020). Effects of monitoring and evaluation planning on implementation of poverty alleviation mariculture projects in the coast of Kenya. *Marine Policy*, 119(December 2019), 104050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104050>

OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. (2019). Better Criteria for Better Evaluation. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

Patton, M. Q. (2002). UTILIZATION-FOCUSED EVALUATION (U-FE) CHECKLIST. January. [https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1007/0-306-47559-6_23](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1007/0-306-47559-6_23)

Patton, M. Q. (2012). A utilization-focused approach to contribution analysis. *Evaluation*, 18(3), 364-377. Patton, M. Q. (1978). *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2013). Utilization-Focused Evaluation Checklist. The Evaluation Center Western Michigan University, January, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4>

Patton, N.Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*, 4th ed (2015),

Porter, S., Goldman, I., (2013). A Growing Demand for Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa. *African Evaluation Journal* 2013;1(1), Art. #25, 9 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/aej.v1i1.25> <https://aejonline.org/index.php/aej/article/view/25>

Quezada, G. V. (2005). Performance evaluation models for strategic decision-making: Towards a hybrid model. 183. <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1052/>

Richard, T. H. (2012). Organizational applications of business intelligence management: emerging trends. IGI Global. <https://www.igi-global.com/book/organizational-applications-business-intelligence-management/59739>

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skills building approach*. (4th Ed).

Shapiro, J. (2018). Monitoring and evaluation Overview. <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/resources/toolkits/610-monitoring-and-evaluation>

Tukei et al. (2016). Risk Analysis and Staff Performance of Kampala Metropolitan Police-

Uganda. International Journal of Technology and Management, 1(11).
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330934827%0ARisk>

Wamuntu, M. (2017). An Evaluation Of Agricultural Financing Practices And Productivity Of Agricultural Cooperatives In Kamwenge District. May, 40.
<https://utamu.ac.ug/docs/research/studentresearch/masters/proposals/MichaelWamuntu.pdf>

Weiss, C. H. (1999). The interface between evaluation and public policy. Evaluation, 5(4), 468-486.