Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Building on Sustainability of Disaster Emergency Preparedness Program in Uasin Gishu County

David Kipkemboi Komen

University of Nairobi

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.7858

Received: 22 May 2023; Accepted: 01 June 2023; Published: 09 September 2023

ABSTRACT

Disasters have become a typical occurrences all around the globe. Certainly, their frequency has grown as economic growth, technological sophistication, and vulnerability to disadvantaged groups has risen. Natural calamities are predicted to cause the deaths of one million people worldwide per decade. There is minimal evidence that M&E of disaster response operations leads to better results in terms of more effective practice. As such, the aim of this research will be to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation capacity building on sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness program in Uasin Gishu County. This study adopted theory of Sustainability. This study used an explanatory research design. Because of the limited number of workers, a census survey will be used; this research target population will be 52 workers of the Disaster Emergency Preparedness Program and M&E in Uasin Gishu County. Questionnaires was used to collect data. Data analysis process will begin with questionnaire editing. Collected data were coded into Statistical package for social science (SPSS) for analysis. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentages, means and standard deviations were calculated, and data presented in form of tables. Inferential statistics used were regression model. The study findings revealed that M&E capacity building has a positive and significant effect on Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs (β_1=0.885, p=0.000<0.05). The study concluded that Disasters and emergencies impact population health, and their consequences can be mitigated by planning, exercises, and preparedness. Monitoring and evaluation are essential for the sustainability of projects, including disaster emergency preparedness programs. Therefore, it can be concluded that monitoring and evaluation have a positive influence on the sustainability of projects. It can help in preventing, preparing for, respond to, and recover from humanitarian emergencies and large outbreaks. The study recommends that there is need for establishment of coordinating mechanisms, planning, financing, and implementing strategies to ensure the program's sustainability. Developing a monitoring and evaluation framework that includes clear indicators to measure the program's effectiveness and sustainability.

Keywords: Monitoring and Evaluation, Capacity Building, Sustainability Disaster Emergency, Preparedness, Program.

INTRODUCTION

The notion of sustainability provides a framework for comprehending global challenges such as economic development, societal development, and natural resource management (Prell, Hubacek & Reed, 2016). All international development agencies need help with sustainability. It is also one of the key engagement concepts to IFAD's identity and influence. Sustainability was identified as a critical problem in the IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010.

Despite substantial advances in IFAD operations' sustainability, particularly in the two years ending in 2010, this issue remains a key concern (Kesseba & Mathur, 2019). A collection of actions that range from the formulation of the vision, scope, and labour effort through the execution and evaluation of the individual

or institution's goals is a project (Meredith, Shafer, & Mantel Jr, 2017).

Monitoring and evaluation are associated with continuously collecting relevant data on process-related activities and effectively using the material, human, and financial program resources. The integrity of project data should be adequate, acceptable, accurate, reliable and valid (Jassor, 2016). Monitoring and evaluation are crucial processes that aid in the long-term effectiveness of a project. Sustainability benchmarks and barometers for monitoring and evaluation, according to Mukaria (2021), are vital in classifying and documenting the bionomical, economic, and social components, as well as tracking performance on M&E. Capacity development is viewed as a more purposeful process in which individuals, organizations, or society as a whole establish, strengthen, or preserve this capacity through time. M&E training and development provide project planners with the skills and knowledge to manage the project effectively and efficiently. According to Marle, Vidal, Marle, and Vidal (2016), the information obtained may be passed on to juniors participating in project execution. Furthermore, enticement can be used as part of the desire to offer high-quality and acceptable outputs. The primary component influencing project sustainability is monitoring and evaluating resource allocation in creating this research. Data acquired should be used the purposely for what was obtained. The importance of project data quality in monitoring and evaluation must be balanced for resource allocation and actions to avoid rework.

Globally, nations like the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada are significant benefactors to developing countries. There is an American Evaluation Association in the United States (AEA). According to the World Bank (2009), the necessity for strong governance and sustained and quick growth in Africa led to the noticing of Monitoring and Evaluation as a profession, forming the first African Monitoring and Evaluation Association in 1998. Establishing an efficient M&E system is extremely valuable since it increases transparency and gives a clear regulatory framework for attaining objectives (World Bank, 2012).

Australia is amongst the world's leaders in incorporating M&E systems into development projects and disaster preparedness initiatives (UNDP, 2012). The government established a fully-fledged government assessment system overseen by the Department of Finance (DOF). Through good processes, the Australian government championed program management, monitoring, and evaluation, involving continuity in the effectiveness and efficiency of the government's initiatives.

Kenya's disaster preparedness needs to be more cohesive, with the government frequently preferring reactive rather than proactive measures. It has been difficult to determine where agencies' mandates begin and stop. Still, several groups and government agencies manage various aspects of disaster planning and response (Ministry of Devolution and Planning, 2015). Each organization has its own set of political and institutional interests and allegiances, which may outweigh the benefits of collaboration and partnerships. Uasin Gishu Country is well prepared on paper, but this is different. Coordination was thought to be better before to devolution when disaster preparedness was administered at the national level and trickled down to the county level via county disaster committees (which do not presently exist at the county level) (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2016). This study sought to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation capacity building on sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness program in Uasin Gishu County.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theory of Sustainability

Sustainability theory is concerned with the economic standpoint, describing project sustainability as obtaining the present wants cohort without jeopardizing the potential to satisfy the generations requirements in the future. The theory was launched in 1972 as part of the International Union for Nature Conservation's World Conservation Strategy, and it was revisited by Laberge in 2015. Following Laberge's review, by

defining sustainability of projects developments as a sort of human activities that sustains and feeds the historical performances of community on whole existence on earth through ongoing services supply and benefit realizations by theory revising the social and economic components.

The sustainability theory stresses a project's financial and economic views. It goes on to describe project sustainability as economic growth that provides the community with the essential facilities, development environment, and resources. Furthermore, sustainable initiatives must support life in the coming decades. Laberge (2015) expanded on the notion by discussing institutions' social responsibility. In reality, sustainability entails a number of components that assure timely, effective, and constant performance and achievement of project goals. Programs achieves sustainability by combining, social, environmental and economic goal, as said by Corvers, Wiek, Kraker, Lang, and Martens (2016). The WCED defined sustainable project development as achieving fairness between different ages. It is important to remember that sustainable community-based initiatives include bionomical, natural, legal, political, and psychological factors that are essential in any project process. Time, money, and benefit dimensions are all required for sustainability (Corvers et al., 2016). The present view does not consider unsustainable behavior to be an urgent existential danger. In this instance, both present and future hazards may be addressed through sustainable development. As a result, sustainability theory is required to aid researchers in understanding project sustainability indicators. Since it promotes the varied sustainability of government programs hence this theory is relevant to the study.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted Explanatory research design. The target population for this study was 52 M&E and disaster preparedness staff at Uasin Gishu County. A census survey was adopted. The main researched instruments was questionnaires.

Data analysis process will begin with questionnaire editing. Collected data were coded into Statistical package for social science (SPSS) for analysis. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentages, means and standard deviations were calculated, and data presented in form of tables. Inferential statistics used were regression model as given;

$$y = \alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \varepsilon_i$$

y represent sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness program

α represent constant.

β_1 represent the coefficient of the monitoring and evaluation capacity building.

x_1 represent monitoring and evaluation capacity building

ε represent error term

Analyzed data will be presented in form of frequency tables.

FINDINGS

Response Rate

A total of 52 questionnaires were issued to the respondents, and total of 47 were fully filled and returned for analysis. This represented a 90.4% questionnaire response rate. According to Kothari (2010) when the rate

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS |

is 75%, then it is appropriate to continue with the study.

Descriptive Analysis for M&E Capacity Building

The first specific objective of the study was to determine the influence of M&E capacity building on sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness program in Uasin Gishu County. Table 1 presents the study results.

Table 1 Descriptive Analysis for M&E Capacity Building

		SD	D	UD	A	SA	Total	Mean	Std.
There is clear M&E resource plan	F	1	2	5	18	21	47	4.19	0.95
	%	2.1	4.3	10.6	38.3	44.7	100.0		
There is inadequate capacity in terms of staff	F	1	7	13	12	14	47	3.66	1.13
	%	2.1	14.9	27.7	25.5	29.8	100.0		
There is a system embedded in the projects to monitor resource allocation	F	2	2	5	19	19	47	4.09	1.04
	%	4.3	4.3	10.6	40.4	40.4	100.0		
There is no support structure in my organization	F	1	7	11	8	20	47	3.83	1.20
	%	2.1	14.9	23.4	17.0	42.6	100.0		
Our M&E unit is adequately staffed	F	4	2	4	19	18	47	3.96	1.20
	%	8.5	4.3	8.5	40.4	38.3	100.0		

The study findings from Table 1 revealed that that majority 39(83.0%) of the respondents agreed that there is clear M&E resource plan. On the contrary to that 3(6.4%) of the respondents disagreed that there is clear M&E resource plan. Further the study findings revealed in terms of mean and standard deviation that the respondents agreed that There is clear M&E resource plan (Mean=4.19, Standard deviation=0.95).

On top of that the study findings revealed that 26(55.3%) of the respondents agree that there is inadequate capacity in terms of staff. On contrary 8(17.0%) of the respondents disagreed that there is inadequate capacity in terms of staff. Further, the results also showed in terms of mean and standard deviation that the respondents agree that there is inadequate capacity in terms of staff (Mean=3.66, Standard deviation=1.13).

The study findings further revealed that 38(80.8%) of the respondents agree that there is a system embedded in the projects to monitor resource allocation. However, on the other hand 4(8.6%) of the respondents disagreed there is a system embedded in the projects to monitor resource allocation. Further, the study results also showed in terms of mean and standard deviation that the respondents agree that there is a system embedded in the projects to monitor resource allocation. (Mean=4.09, Standard deviation=1.04).

The study findings furthermore revealed that 28(59.6%) of the respondents agreed that there is no support structure in my organization. However, on the other hand 8(17.0%) of the respondents disagreed that there is no support structure in my organization. Further, the study results revealed in terms of mean and standard deviation that majority of the respondents agreed that there is no support structure in my organization (Mean=3.83, Standard deviation=1.20).

Finally, 37(78.7%) of the respondents agree that their M&E unit is adequately staffed. On contrary, 6(12.8%) of the respondents disagreed that their M&E unit is adequately staffed. Further, the results also showed in terms of mean and standard deviation that the respondents agree that their M&E unit is adequately staffed (Mean=3.96, Standard deviation=1.20).

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS |

The simple linear regression for M&E capacity building and Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs was carried out and the results are presented in Table 2, 3 and 4

Table 2 Regression Model Summary of M&E capacity building

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.915[a]	.837	.834	.38927

The model summary results in Table 2 indicated that R = 0.915 and R^2 =0.837. R value gives an indication that there is a linear association between M&E capacity building and Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs. The R^2 indicates that explanatory power of the independent variables is 0.837. This means that about 83.7 percent of the variation in sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs is explained by M&E capacity building.

Table 3 Model Fitness Results

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	35.083	1	35.083	231.528	.000[b]
Residual	6.819	45	.152		
Total	41.902	46			

Table 3 indicated that the F-statistics produced (F = 231.528) which was significant at p=0.000 thus confirms the fitness of the model. Therefore, there is statistically significant association between M&E capacity building and sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness program in Uasin Gishu county, Kenya. This means that the independent variable (M&E capacity building) is a significant predictor of the dependent variable (Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness program).

Table 4 Regression Coefficients of M&E capacity building

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
(Constant)	.542	.238		2.275	.028
M&E capacity building	.885	.058	.915	15.216	.000

Regression of coefficients results in Table 4 showed that M&E capacity building has a positive and significant effect on Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs ($?_1$=0.885, p=0.000<0.05). This implied that a unit increase in M&E capacity building lead to 0.885 units increase in Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs.

The optimal model of the regression was;

$$\mathbf{Y = 0.542 + 0.885X_1} \quad \textbf{Equation 4.1}$$

$\mathbf{H_{01}}$: M&E capacity building has no significant effect on sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. The regression results in Table 4 indicate that there is significant

relationship between M&E capacity building Sustainability of disaster emergency preparedness programs in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya and with a beta coefficient of 0.885 and significance of (p= 0.000). The study rejected the null hypothesis.

CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

Disasters and emergencies impact population health, and their consequences can be mitigated by planning, exercises, and preparedness. Monitoring and evaluation are essential for the sustainability of projects, including disaster emergency preparedness programs. Therefore, it can be concluded that monitoring and evaluation have a positive influence on the sustainability of projects. It can help in preventing, preparing for, respond to, and recover from humanitarian emergencies and large outbreaks.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that there is need for establishment of coordinating mechanisms, planning, financing, and implementing strategies to ensure the program's sustainability. Developing a monitoring and evaluation framework that includes clear indicators to measure the program's effectiveness and sustainability. Uasin Gishu County to use framework as a guide in developing a monitoring and evaluation plan that is specific to disaster emergency preparedness. The plan should include indicators, targets, data sources, and methods of data collection and analysis.

REFERENCE

1. Jassor, M. (2016). Factors influencing sustainability of youth group projects funded by youth enterprise development fund in Bomet county, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
2. Kesseba, A. M., & Mathur, S. (2019). Ifad's Role in The Generation of Sustainable Agricultural Technologies. In Technology Systems for Small Farmers (pp. 11-44). CRC Press.
3. Marle, F., Vidal, L. A., Marle, F., & Vidal, L. A. (2016). Project management traditional principles. Managing Complex, High-Risk Projects: A Guide to Basic and Advanced Project Management, 1-52.
4. Meredith, J. R., Shafer, S. M., & Mantel Jr, S. J. (2017). Project management: a strategic managerial approach. John Wiley & Sons.
5. Mukaria, E. M. (2021). Monitoring, Evaluation Practices and Sustainability of Community-Based Projects in Embu County, Kenya. International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management, 3(3), 1-22.
6. Prell, C., Hubacek, K., & Reed, M. (2016). Stakeholder analysis and social network analysis in natural resource management. In Handbook of applied system science (pp. 367-383). Routledge.