Journal of Business Research and Reports

SCIENTIFIC Research and Community

Research Article

Open Access

Monitoring and Evaluation Assessments and Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda

Martha Christine Olwenyi[1], Dorothy Ndunge kyalo[2], Raphael Nyonje[3] and Reuben Wambua Kikwatha[4]

[1]PhD Candidate, Department of Management Science and Project Planning, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

[2]Proffessor of Education, Department of Education Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

[3]Proffessor of Education, Department of Education Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

[4]Doctor of Project Planning and Management, Department of Management Science and Project Planning, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

ABSTRACT

In Uganda, the performance of Global Partnership for Education projects is highly determined by a number of factors that include monitoring and evaluation. The projects have realized outstanding results that require professional assessment to pave way for output improvement. in relation to the scheduled timelines, the project completion rates have deteriorated. As a result, stakeholders do not get value for their time and there is increased cost overrun. This study therefore sought to examine the influence of M&E assessments on performance of GPE projects in Uganda, partaking the field case from the districts of Bukedea and Katakwi. The study presented monitoring and evaluation assessment as the independent variable, and performance of Global partnership for education projects, as the dependent variable. The study was based on the System theory, Organisational learning theory and Results Based Management theory. The study was guided by the study objective: to establish how monitoring and evaluation assessment influence performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda.

The study approach integrated both quantitative and qualitative features to guarantee methodological triangulation. Data was collected by means of interview guides and questionnaires. Questionnaires were administered on 92 randomly selected staff Teachers from the districts of Bukedea and Katakwi and interview guides were administered to 56 GPE secretariat and District officials and SMC Members. The study intended to analyse present findings using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics involved the use of frequency tables, means, standard deviations in general terms of describing the dataset. Inferential statistics such as Normality tests, Correlation, simple linear regression and Predictive multiple linear regression were also utilised in answering the research questions and hypotheses of the study.

Data was analysed, presented and interpreted in line with the study objective using thematic and sub thematic areas of M & E assessments and Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects. Questionnaires were used as a tool for data collection, with the size of 92 respondents comprising of teachers. Out of the 92 questionnaires, 70 were filled and returned, representing a return rate of 76.1% as recommended response rate to verify consistency of required measurement for analysis. The study examined the respondents in respect to their gender, designation, education level, years of service and duration of working with Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda, to assess whether they have any implications on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects.

The study findings revealed that the act of planning for routine monitoring significantly influenced the performance of GPE projects in public primary schools. However, assessments were rarely conducted independently by external M & E officers.

The study concluded that M & E Assessment emerged as the most critical M&E component and significantly influenced the performance of GPE projects. Therefore, Project implementation committees should ensure proper assessment to enable involvement of stakeholders for better performance of projects.
Key words; Global partnership for education, M&E assessments, routine monitoring, project completion rates.

***Corresponding author**

Martha Christine Olwenyi, PhD Candidate, Department of Management Science and Project Planning, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.

Received: March 19, 2025; **Accepted:** March 25, 2025; **Published:** March 31, 2025

Background

Introduction

In project management environment, several factors contribute to project performance. Researchers have identified Critical Performance Factors (CPFs) such as behavior, terms, and variable which could result in major impact on the project performance when implemented and monitored to sustain results. Considering performance of education projects, certain expectations for stakeholders, implementers and project beneficiaries are met in an efficient and effective manner . However, these project performance expectations need to be assessed through a monitoring lens by assessing the practices and establish the extent to which each practice contributes to improved performance, according to the indicators in the conceptual framework which includes completion rate, enrolment, retention, pass rates, empowerment of beneficiaries, beneficiary satisfaction, percentage of teachers trained and use of the knowledge gained innovatively and creatively [2,13,16].

World over, legitimate government and public projects are run basing on strong M&E assessment, a practice that looks at what organizations do after project planning stage. This assessment may look at routine monitoring which assesses achievement of results at activity level and output levels and evaluations assessing results at outcome and impact level. As a practice, M&E assessment looks at what organisations do after project planning stage, and this assessment will look at routine monitoring which assesses achievement of results at activity and output levels, and evaluations assessing results at outcome and impact level. In other words, assessment is referred to as an evaluation intended to determine whether intended results are attained or not. Relatedly, M&E information provides critical assessment that help demonstrate whether or not projects satisfy target groups needs and priorities. according to, assessment is referred to as the process conducted after designing program's strategy. She claims that it helps people to know whether they have implemented strategies as planned [18,32].

Over the years, there has been the need to evaluate initiatives because most of them tend to be costly, unsustainable and compete for funding priorities. The process of assessing them requires to be monitored and evaluated throughout project cycles and commitment of various groups of people. Ile, eke (2012), emphasised that the need for delivering tangible results at public and private sector has intensified over the years with stakeholders pressuring organizations to be efficient in project management. In spite of this, organizations are expected to deliver better results within environments of scarce resources. With the help of effective tools, organizations can deliver desired results if they plan effectively and work towards attaining set goals. M&E project assessment explains performance through tracking and assessment of the projects [17,22].

Addressing Education project performance, the context-based factors considered critical for assessing project performance are those that may contribute to success or failure. Nevertheless, most studies in the education sector focus on the conventional 'Iron triangle' which encompass Scope, quality, schedule and cost.This implies that the scope of the syllabus coverage with the expected content, is a key indicator of performance. The contention is that the cost of delivering the education, the quality of the education delivered, and the timely delivery of the education in terms of completion rates in the education cycle are critical concerns. This focus on Iron Triangle created an interest among researchers to look at other factors that contributed to good project performance, such as involvement of project teams, level of skills among project teams, resources, quality of project outcome and methods used to deliver integrated project, which are normally not taken as performance factors [28,37,46].

In Uganda, the state of education sector is wanting even though the country is among the pioneers of developing basic education in Sub-Saharan Africa. As soon as the Universal Primary Education (UPE) was developed in 1997, the rate of enrolment in primary schools rose from 2.5 million to 8.3 million between 1996 and 2015. This translated to a Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) of 118 percent in 2011 before stabilizing at 111 percent in 2017. Although this was good, it undermined the quality of education in public primary schools. Overall, the rate of enrolment to primary school in Uganda is on par with the Kenyan one and is relatively higher due to the enrolment of under-aged and over-aged children (United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, [29,42].

This explains the introduction of Global partnership for Education (GPE) in uganda. GPE was established in 2002 as the world's only multilateral partnership solely devoted to improving the provision of quality basic education in fragile states, mainly in Africa and Asia. (GPE,2014). Hence GPE is a partnership between donors and civil society governments, international organisations, multilateral agencies among others to mobilise technical and financial resources towards meeting greatest education needs. GPE is implementing the Uganda Teacher and School Effectiveness Project (UTSEP) in order to support the implementation of the Broader Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) aimed at addressing the various primary education challenges (Ministry of Education and Sports. GPE has been successful in achieving some of the project objectives. For example, GPE (2016) reported that they trained 2,680 head teachers in Early Grade Reading (EGR), in 16 PTCs across Uganda. Besides, The World Bank reported that approximately 10,000 pupils had received textbooks from GPE by June 2018 [40].

Despite these promising results, in the case of Uganda, it was not possible to determine whether the education sector plan objectives and expected output were achieved. This was because of substantial limitations in sector planning and monitoring. Many limitations were presented in 2010-2015 and 2017-2020 education sector plans such as weak monitoring frameworks, large financial gaps and unpredictable funding allocations.

Much as GPE (2021) reported 70% of partner countries improving learning outcomes and promotion of gender equality, in Uganda with negative trends in primary enrollment, there was lack of sufficient institutional capacity building needed to drive system level changes. For instance, primary and secondary completion rates have remained low, while primary school repetition rates remain high. Besides, there was low access to education for children from poor backgrounds, children with disabilities and those from refugee communities. On a lighter note, there were positive gender gaps for girls in primary schools and improvement in the number of girls enrolling in secondary education.

Even though the rate of enrolment in primary school continues to rise due to population growth, the tripling of the enrolment process has resulted to serious challenges in the education sector. The studies show that even though the rate of enrolment is relatively high, the number of students that complete primary school annually does not equal the enrolment rate implying that

majority of the students drop out of school before they complete studies. Despite the persistence of the challenge over the years, the primary completion rate has not improved much as expected over a decade. According to UBOS (2018), the rate stood at 44 percent. Although many factors contribute to low completion rates, it is evident that the delivery of low quality services in the education sector also contributes to the problem. (ESID,2016; UNICEF,2018)This is supported by high repetition rates that stand at between 10 and 12 percent annually or even higher. (Matinda et al.,2018,p.7). Although the repetition rate is aimed at ensuring that students pass national examinations, it discourages majority of them; hence, result to high rate of dropout that undermine the completion rate. This indicates that the expansion of the enrolment rate was not accompanied by measures aimed at improving the quality of education and accomodating the new students to minimize overcrowding [4,25,43,45].

The learning crisis still remains a challenge in that even though UPE improved the rate of enrolment, no effort was made to improve learning outcomes (Richards, 2011). Evidence shows that only 6 percent of Ugandan students in fourth grade can read comfortably, which is relatively below to the rate of such students from comparable countries like Rwanda, Tanzania and Kenya. Numeracy skills are far much worse because only 2 percent of the students can solve mathematical problems in the same grade form. The rate is far much below the Tanzanian and Kenyan ones, which stand at 9 and 10 percent respectively

Theoretical Framework

This study was generated from the Systems Theory (ST) advanced by Ludwig von Bertalanffy and later improved to become General System Theory by Kenneth Boulding, Daniel Katz, and Robert Kahn in 1964. The system theory emphasizes the way in which organizational projects are seen as an organized system comprising of human and non-human that respond in a way to cope with noteworthy changes in their environment but still keep their structures intact Adams et al., 2014. In this sense, the ST concept contemplates organizations as constantly interacting with both their internal and external environment. In reference to system theory, multi project environment is taken as complex but adaptive system, characterized by interrelationships that exist between variables or components. In the context of this study, GPE as an organization was taken as a system with various components including projects, her internal processes and its interaction with the outside actors (GPE members& other stakeholders) and how it is responding to and how its pre-existing response mechanisms works to maintain good project performance. In other words, GPE as an organization is a system that has various subsystems; culture, human resources, top management, financial processes and information processing systems. Further, a system is viewed as consisting of subsystems whose inter-dependence and inter-relationships move towards the equilibrium of larger systems. The M &E Practices under M&E Assessment is a subsystem and through the interactions and interrelationship influence the performance of Education projects supported by GPE in Uganda [1,24]

.

More so, the input-through output concept that describes organizational environments in the context of a system inter related with subsystems is of relevance in system theory. Given that ST considers the concept as an interaction with external environment, then the elements of purpose such as structure, information, techniques, project performance and people (culture) should be coordinated as systems

This coordination needs to be combined with managerial system/ leadership so that it can maximize value for organizations. In analysing GPE as organization, ST is appropriate because GPE takes into consideration the cycle of inputs and transformation of outputs to outcomes. These relationships comprise of GPE project, organizational systems and subsystems in holistic approach that is aimed at maintaining high project performance. The subsystems include management, financial, human resource and information management. All these systems work towards ensuring achievement of the set project outcomes including quality of products and services for federation members and stakeholders. For instance, information processing theory sees organizations implementing projects as open systems that must collect, collate and process information in order to accomplish specific tasks, coordinate various activities to achieve some outcomes. Project environment within GPE can be treated as open systems where projects are implemented with an aim of achieving specific project goals. In order to assess project performance information, need to be collected and analysed. The system theory and information processing theory confirm the existence and importance of project interdependence [8,19].

Research Methodology

Research Design

The study employed cross sectional, descriptive survey design and correlation research design. The choice of the two-research design was informed by data collection and analysis methodology. The design allowed for both descriptive and inferential methods, facilitated by mixed method approach that provided a continuum mechanism for analysing the data. Surveys were also employed to enable the researcher describe the characteristics of the issue under investigation, using the data that would be collected. The method also enabled the researcher to answer research questions adequately. The ccorrelation design was also utilized to determine the extent to which variables included in the study related to each other. Accordingly, both correlational and descriptive research designs were critical to the study and attainment of its objectives. The descriptive design enabled the researcher to describe the issue under investigation whereas the correlation research design helped the researcher to identify the link between variables via correlation and regression models [7,20].

The study targeted a population of school staff members that had implemented the GPE project from 2015 to 2017 supported by World Bank as a donor and Ministry of Education in Uganda. The Schools were spread in the whole country. There is a total of 100 schools and on average each school has about 12 teachers, 15 School Management Committee members. Out of 100 schools, where the GPE project was implemented, 30 of those schools were in the region of Bukedea and Katakwi, where 10 schools were purposively selected for the study. The focus of 10 schools was that they are spread across the sub counties of the districts hence greater representation. From the identified population, a sample of 10 schools from a population of 30 schools was determined using Krejci and Morgan 1970 table of determining sample size. Through simple random sampling proportionate to size of teachers in the school, the teachers were sampled as shown in Table below.

Table 1: Sample Size Determination

Category	Population	Sample size	Sampling Technique
Schools	30	10	
Teachers	120	92	Simple random sampling
GPE secretariat and District officials	20	6	Purposive
SMC Members	90	90	Purposive
Total	260	198	

Sampling Procedure

The study was guided by a mixed method research. Both parametric and non-parametric methods were used hence the study employed both concurrent and sequential mixed approaches. Concurrent mixed sampling was preferred, because it allowed triangulation of results, confirmed, cross validated or corroborated the findings within a single study. Concurrent sampling allowed use of a single sample generated from probability (random) and non-probability (purposive) techniques to generate data for quantitative and qualitative strands for the study using both closed and open-ended survey questionnaires [5].

Sampling frame was a register of schools that implemented the GPE project in Bukedea and katakwi Districts. Whereas school registers were used as sampling frames for individual students included in the study. Out of 30 schools in Bukedea and katakwi Districts where GPE was implemented, 10 that implemented GPE projects were purposively selected and then clustered per the sub counties. This was to ensure that there was representation across the districts. Hence a sample of 92 teachers were sampled using simple random sampling. To get the specific 92 teachers per school, the teachers were arranged in alphabetical order and using random number calculator, the number of teachers were picked randomly.

Other respondents for the FGD such as the School management committee and KII such as the GPE project staff, DEO, School inspectors were drawn from the sampled schools and at District level, Ministry level. Such respondents included GPE project and school leaders. A second category of respondents were at Ministry level for staff members that supported the implementation of GPE projects in Uganda whereas a third category included GPE World Bank top leadership overseeing the implementation of projects by the Ministry.

Research Instruments

The study employed open and close ended questionnaires for teachers while self-administered interview guide was used for key informants that comprise of School /District, Ministry/World bank top management. The focused group discussions guide was utilized to assemble information from School management committee members and teachers who did not provide data via questionnaires.

Pilot Testing of Research Instruments

The questionnaire was first administered to 30 respondents from the teachers of the schools that did not participate in the survey but implemented the GPE project. After the testing, the instruments were improved as appropriate.

Validity of Research Instruments.

Pilot testing was utilized to enhance the validity of the questionnaires that were utilized to collect data from respondents, to ensure that the instrument measured what it was supposed to measure, with the implication that data collected with it represents respondents' opinions. This entailed making sure that the research questions were clear and that their meaning was relatively the same among respondents. In this, major concern was about the truthfulness of results.

The operationalization of the variables was carried out carefully to enhance the construct validity. This involved making sure that translations were conducted in the right way to reflect construct's true meaning [23,36].

This was in accordance with Zohrabi who related construct validity with the way researchers transform or translate ideas and/or concepts into functional realities. The content validity was addressed via theoretical definition of the variables. Triangulation method was utilized to enhance the accuracy of qualitative findings. The process entailed obtaining data from different sources to improve internal validity, spending sufficient time collecting the data and using peer debrief to review qualitative questions so that the account would resonate with people rather than the. The prescribed interviews were presented to the respondents to verify and confirm the contents therein [15,41].

Reliability of Research Instruments

Different procedures were utilized to enhance the consistency of study's findings as suggested by Zohrabi (2013). The contention was to ensure commonality of findings if an instrument would be utilized to collect data for a second or a third time (Kothari and Garg, 2014). Some of those methods involved triangulating the data by combining qualitative and quantitative data. Others involved sampling respondents to ensure that if the study would be repeated, the instrument would provide almost similar responses.

The questionnaire of Likert type was used as the main instrument hence it is important to test the internal consistency to check how well they fit the concepts to be used in the study. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient was calculated. A reliability coefficient range between zero (0) and one (1) is deemed fit. The zero coefficient shows that a tool lacks internal consistency whereas a value of one show that it has high internal consistency. indicated that a reliable instrument should have a coefficient of at least 0.7 values. Accordingly, a value of between 0.7 and 1 was used to depict the instrument's internal consistency [39].

Data Collection Procedures

Permission was sought from relevant authorities to conduct the research including National Council for Higher Education which gave ethical clearance, relevant County offices and Ministry of Education leadership. Planning meetings were held with the project team to help plan for the data collection schedule. Four research assistants were recruited and trained how to collect and enter data so that they can assist the data collection and entry process. Intensive training was used to equip them with the information they required throughout the data collection process. Research ethics were observed to ensure that no respondent will be harmed in any way throughout the data collection process. Overall, the research assistants were the ones that administered questionnaires to respondents under the supervisions of the researcher.

Methods of Data Analysis

The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistical analysis to test the study hypotheses. Non-parametric test analysed the data descriptively by determining its measures of dispersion and central tendency. Both means and standard deviations were used to analyse the data descriptively. The data was expected to be normally distributed because most of the schools in the study region were relatively the same. As such, the data was evaluated to determine the strength of central tendency.

Parametric data analysis was employed by use of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r). The (r) evaluated the linear link between variables particularly the independent and the dependent variable. In testing the hypotheses, the (r) used F-Test. The Pearson's product correlation coefficient was preferred since the variables under study were parametric variables. Qualitative data from Key informant interviews (KII) and Focus Group Discussion were first categorized and organized by identifying major themes through coding. Analysis was done using key themes in line with the research questions [14]

Likert Scale as a Measurement Interval Measure

A Likert scale was used on all the sections of questionnaire, and as such a value of 1 indicated the 1st response (Strongly disagree), 2 indicated the 2ND(Disagree), the 3rd. (Not Sure), 4 the 4th (Agree)and 5 the 5th (Strongly agree). In all cases, means were approximated to absolute terms in order to gauge the scale in which they laid upon (a mean for instance of 1.57 was approximated to 2, implying most of the responses were around the response number 2). Standard deviations of the cases, were used to determine the spread of the values from the mean, a large standard deviation indicated a large range of response from the mean.

Linearity Test

To explore the linear relationships of the variables, a scatter plot of the composite means of the dependent variable and independent variable was done and presented. Composite means of performance of Global Partnerships for Education projects in Uganda was used as the dependent variable to test its relationship with M &E Assessment as the independent variable.

Tests of Hypothesis

Correlation and Regression models were used to test the strength of independent variable as far as their influence on the dependent variable is concerned. The contribution of M&E assessments on performance of Global Partnerships for Education projects in Uganda was determined using the Coefficient of Determination. F statistics which was used to test the Hypothesis of the study.

Table 2: Model for Hypothesis Testing

Objective	Hypotheses	Model for Hypothesis Testing
To assess the influence of M&E Assessments on performance of Education projects supported by GPE in Uganda.	H02: M&E Assessments has no significant influence on performance of Education projects supported by GPE in Uganda	$y = \beta 0 + \beta 2\ X2 + \varepsilon$ =Performance of Education projects - β0= Constant term β2= Beta Coefficient X2= M& E Assessments ε= Error term

Ethical Issues

A written communication seeking permission to carry out the research was done to National Council for Higher Education in Uganda. To the targeted respondents, formal letters were used to seek their voluntary informed consent to participate in the research. Respondents were assured that information sought would only be used for the purpose of research. Every respondent was to be respected, treated with dignity and will be made to understand that whatever role they played would be greatly appreciated. Throughout the research exercise, ethical principles were observed in the constitutional rights of every person and as such informed consent was sought from the respondents and was assured of confidentiality of the data and information to be collected.

Data Analysis, Presentation and Interpretation

Introduction

The section presents findings of the study which have been analysed in line with the study objective using thematic and sub thematic areas as follows: questionnaire return rate, background information of the respondents and thematic areas of M & E Planning and Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda.

Questionnaire Return Rate

The study used questionnaires as a tool for Organizational culture. The sample size of the study was 92 respondents comprising of teachers. Out of the 92 questionnaires, 70 were filled and returned. This represented a return rate of 76.1% which was good when compared to the recommended response rate to verify consistency of measurements required for analysis (70% based on Bougie & Sekaran, 2020).

Table 3: Questionnaire Return Rate

Questionnaire	Number	Percentage %
Delivered	92	100
Returned	70	76.1
Not returned	22	24.9

Source: Primary data (2021)

However, twenty-two questionnaires were not returned despite making several attempts to have them returned, and given that the return rate was adequate for social science research, the study proceeded.

Demographic Information of Respondents

The study examined the respondents in respect to their gender, designation, education level, years of service and duration of working with Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda. It was important to consider the above demographic characteristics of respondents to see whether they have any implications on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda. The respondents who participated in the study were therefore to state their gender, designation, education level, years of service and for how long they had worked with Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda. The results are presented in table below for each category of demographic in focus.

Table: Distribution of Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Features	Category (Code)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	49	70
	Female	21	30
Highest level of education	College Certificate	39	55.7
	Diploma	25	35.7
	Bachelor's degree	6	8.6
Designation	Head teacher	9	12.9
	Class teacher	46	65.7
	Senior Woman/Man	1	1.4
	Teacher	14	20.0
How long have you been involved in GPE projects supported by GPE?	Below 5 Years	35	50.0
	5-10 years	22	31.4
	Over 10 Years	13	18.6
How long has your School been a member of GPE?	Below 5 Years	9	12.9
	5-10 Years	39	55.7
	Over 10 Years	22	31.4

Source: Primary data (2021)

On gender, results from the Table above show that the majority of the respondents, 49(70%) were male while 21(30%) of the respondents were female. The results indicated a slightly larger percentage of men were involved in filling the questionnaires as compared to that of female, thus insinuating that a large number of male working for Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda participated in the study. This overrepresentation of male employees is a clear indication of gender imbalance in staff distribution at Global Partnership for Education projects in Uganda, especially in M&E which may have a negative impact on the effectiveness of M & E practices.

As for the highest level of education of the respondents, results show that 39(55.7%) had attained college certificates, 25(35.7%) had attained Diplomas while 6(8.6%) had attained bachelor's degrees. It was established that majority of the respondents 39(55.7%) were holders of college certificates. Those who had attained diplomas and bachelor's degrees were 31(44.3%). It was therefore true that most of the participants in this study had attained the minimum qualifications (college certificate) implying that the level of education was not wanting in Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda.

On designation, results show that 9(12.9%) were head teachers, 46(65.7%) were class teachers, 1(1.4%) was senior woman/man while 14(20.0%) were teachers. The study established that majority of the respondents 60(85.7%) were class teachers and teachers. It was therefore true that most of the respondents in this study had the clarity of job definitions in their respective departmental sections implying that they were perceived as mature with content and substance not wanting in Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda.

On how long have they been involved in GPE projects supported by GPE, the majority of the respondents, 35(50.0%) stated that they had been involved in GPE projects supported by GPE for a period of below 5 years, followed by respondents whose time lagged between 5 years to 10 years constituting 22(31.4%) while 13(18.6%) stated that they had been involved in GPE projects supported by GPE for a period of Over 10 years. The results indicate that most respondents, 57 (81.4%), had been involved in GPE projects supported by GPE for a long duration of over 4 years and thus had sufficient information on the organization's Monitoring and Evaluation practices (M & E Assessment) which influence Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda.

Considering how long their schools have been members of GPE, results revealed that majority of the respondents 39(55.7%) indicated 5years to 10 years in membership of GPE, 22(31.4%) indicated Over 10 years in membership of GPE while 9(12.9%) revealed that they have been members of GPE below 5 years. The results show that most respondents, 61 (87.1%), had been members of GPE for a long duration of over 7 years. From this analysis, a conclusion can be made that the respondents in this study had adequate information on Monitoring and Evaluation assessment which impact Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda.

Tests for Linear Relationship

Coopers and Schindler, contend that the correlation coefficient indicates the statistical measure of co-variation, or association between two variables which shows both the magnitude of the linear relationship and the direction of that relationship. Babatunde (2020) concedes with the above analogy and opines that a correlation coefficient of less than 0.3 signifies a weak correlation, 0.3 – 0.5 is moderate and greater than 0.5 is strong, with correlation coefficients, $r \geq \pm 0.9$ indicate the presence of multicollinearity in the data set [3,6].

Table 4: Correlation Statistics

Performance of GPE projects	Pearson Correlation	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N	70					
M & E Assessments	Pearson Correlation	.580**	.465**	.540**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000			
	N	70	70	70	70		

Based on the results from the Table above, M & E Assessments is observed to have a significant influence on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda with a percentage contribution of 58%. This result may probably reveal the significance attached to M & E Assessments by the stakeholders especially in providing a way to assessing the crucial link between implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision-makers.

Empirical Presentation and Analysis of Findings

In this section, the researcher used primary data to test and compute frequencies, relationships and hypotheses. Primary data was owing to the fact that they best represented the perceptions of respondents on Monitoring and Evaluation assessments on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda. Respondents were therefore required to assign a discrete value to a preferred level of agreement. Furthermore, this section provides the descriptive statistics before computing inferential statistics. Since the ordinal scale measure was used in taking care of the categories of M & E Assessment and Performance of GPE projects, the descriptive statistics were used to measure the frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviation and Composite Mean Scores. The inferential statistics were used to measure the level at which one variable was affected by another. This was done using correlations as will be presented in the forthcoming subsequent sections.

Performance of GPE projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda

The researcher probed respondents on the state of Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda. The respondents' views were sought on the Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects. The summary of the respondents' opinions is presented in Table below.

Table 5: Distribution of Performance of GPE projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts

Performance statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD
All pupils complete school in the required time	4 (5.7%)	26 (37.1%)	9 (12.9%)	20 (28.6%)	11 (15.7%)	3.11	1.234
Completion rate has improved in the school	1 (1.4%)	18 (25.7%)	13 (18.6%)	34 (48.6%)	4 (5.7%)	3.31	0.971
There has been enhancement in the enrollment count of pupils	0%	5 (7.1%)	2 (2.9%)	41 (58.6%)	22 (31.4%)	4.14	0.785
There has been improvement in classroom utilization rate	0%	7 (10%)	4 (5.7%)	47 (67.1%)	12 (17.1%)	3.91	0.794
Pupils stay in school longer	0%	13 (18.6%)	19 (27.1%)	29 (41.4%)	9 (12.9%)	3.49	0.944
There is low dropout rate of pupils	3 (4.3%)	11 (15.7%)	8 (11.4%)	38 (54.3%)	10 (14.3%)	3.59	1.056
Pupils are passing in Division 1-4	1 (1.4%)	6 (8.6%)	8 (11.4%)	40 (57.1%)	15 (21.4%)	3.89	0.894
Failing rate is reducing	0%	8 (11.4%)	4 (5.7%)	50 (71.4%)	8 (11.4%)	3.83	0.780
Teachers are involved in decision making	0%)	2 (2.9%)	4 (5.7%)	33 (47.1%)	31 (44.3%)	4.33	0.717
Teachers are confident in executing their work	0%	2 (2.9%)	3 (4.3%)	36 (51.4%)	29 (41.4%)	4.31	0.692

Teachers are satisfied with the quality of GPE training	1 (1.4%)	7 (10%)	31 (44.3%)	27 (38.6%)	4 (5.7%)	3.37	0.802
Management is satisfied with quality of GPE training	0%	5 (7.1%)	32 (45.7%)	28 (40%)	5 (7.1%)	3.47	0.737
All teachers received training	7 (10%)	31 (44.3%)	25 (35.7%)	7 (10%)	0%	2.46	0.811
All management received training	4 (5.7%)	32 (45.7%)	27 (38.6%)	7 (10%)	0%	2.53	0.756
Teachers are using the knowledge gained for better teaching	0%	3 (4.3%)	18 (25.7%)	37 (52.9%)	12 (17.1%)	3.83	0.761
Staff participate in the improvement of school performance	0%)	0%)	9 (12.9%)	50 (71.4%)	11 (15.7%)	4.03	0.538
Staff engage more with learners in a creative manner	0%	0%	7 (10%)	55 (78.6%)	8 (11.4%)	4.01	0.466
Composite Mean and Standard Deviation						**3.62**	**0.808**

Source: Primary data (2021).

The Table above shows that there was an effort by the teachers to improve on the Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda (Composite Mean=3.62 and Standard Deviation=0.808).

Findings from Table above show that the majority of the respondents, (42.8%) disagreed that all pupils complete school in the required time. However, (12.9%) of the respondents preferred to be non-committal on this statement. A moderate percentage of (44.3%) agreed that all pupils complete school in the required time. The mean score =3.11 which was below the composite mean score=3.62 reveals that respondents refuted that all pupils complete school in the required time. From this examination of the results, an interpretation can be made that majority of the pupils in Global Partnership for Education projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts do not complete school in the required time probably due to absence of motivation or interest. This result concurs with studies by UNESCO, Education for All 2000-2015 (2015) which opines that the immense progress towards achieving universal access to primary education in Uganda points to a consensus that due to overwhelming population growth, the pupil population tripled between 1997 and 2014 posing a serious problem to the system of universal education. With the absolute number of pupils gradually increasing, as a consequence of the growing sizes of each school cohort, a significant percentage of those who enter primary school do not reach the final primary grade.

Analysis of interview data revealed that some respondents were satisfactory. When one key informant Code named GPE-01 at Amorwong Primary School in Bukedea districts was asked to comment on whether the pupil's complete school in the required time, she had this to say:

"…rarely do all pupils that we start with from primary one complete the primary seven level" [Date: 12-08-2021, Source: Primary information from key informant]. This statement disclosed that some respondents indeed disagreed that all the pupil's complete school in the required time.

The researcher also inquired from the respondents as to whether completion rate has improved in the school. The results show that (54.3) agreed with the statement, (27.1%) disagreed while (18.6%) preferred being non-committal to the statement. From this analysis, an interpretation can be made that a moderate completion rate has improved in the schools where Global Partnership for Education projects are in operation in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda. The mean score =3.31which was slightly below the composite mean score=3.62 reveals that the majority of the respondents refuted the statement that completion rate has improved in the schools.

There was significant evidence that majority of the respondents (90%) agreed (agree and strongly agree) that there has been enhancement in the enrollment count of pupils. A small portion of (7.1%) disagreed with the statement and (2.9%) were non-committal to the statement. The mean score = 4.14 and standard deviation=0.7853 which was faraway above the composite mean score=3.62 and standard deviation=0.808 discloses that the majority of the respondents conceded that there has been enhancement in the enrollment count of pupils. From this analysis of the results, an interpretation can be made that there has been an augmentation in the enrollment count of pupils in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts perhaps due to transformation of teacher characteristics, school governance, and incentives.

The above result concurs with studies that were carried out by the United Nations Development Programme which opined that Monitoring and Evaluation is essential in the management of government development projects as well as giving accountability to the Donors. Donors are certainly entitled to know whether their money is properly spent but the primary use of M&E should be for the organisation or project itself to see how it is performing and to learn how to do it better. supplement the above account by noting that effective project M&E enhances the basis for evidence-based project management decisions which can result in good enrollment count of pupils in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts [21].

The respondents' opinions were also sought on the improvement in classroom utilization rate. The results revealed that the majority of the respondents (84.2%) agreed (agree and strongly agree) that there has been improvement in classroom utilization rate, However, only (10%) refuted while (5.7%) were non-committal with the statement. The mean score = 3.91 which was faraway above the composite mean score=3.62 reveals that the majority of the respondents conceded that there has been improvement in classroom utilization rate. From this analysis of the result, an interpretation can be made that there has been improvement in classroom utilization rates in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts perhaps due to increased teacher time used for teaching. Furthermore, the researcher actualized this result through an interview with a key informant named GPE-03 who had this to say:

"…indeed, I have witnessed tremendous improvements in classroom utilization rates on the basis of Global Partnership for Education Projects in our school. [Date: 06-09-2021, Source: Primary information from key informant]. This declaration confirmation that some respondents coincided that there has been improvement in classroom utilization rate due to Global Partnership for Education Projects schools.

The respondents' sentiments were also sought on pupils stay in school longer. The results exhibited that a moderate percentage (54.3%) agreed (strongly agree and agree) with the statement. A small portion of the respondents (18.6%) disagreed and (27.1%) preferred to be non-committal with the statement. From the results, there is significant evidence that there is low dropout rate of pupils. Results also propose that Pupils are passing in Division 1-4 (78.5%).

Results also suggest that, failing rate is reducing in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts (82.8%). This result may probably imply that Global Partnership for Education Projects schools' management in Katakwi and Bukedea districts are motivated and interested in supporting the pupils in their academic endeavours. The above result was supported by the mean score = 3.83 which was faraway above the composite mean score=3.62 revealing that the majority of the respondents conceded that failing rate is reducing. From this analysis of the result, an interpretation can be made that failing rate is reducing in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts perhaps due to increased teacher time used for teaching or teachers are motivated and interested in supporting the pupils in their academic endeavours. Analysis of interview data revealed that some respondents were satisfactory. When one key informant Code named GPE-02 at Usuk Girls Primary School in Bukedea districts was asked to comment on the failing rate, she had this to say:

"…upper class teachers are committed to their work. sometimes we have seminars which have greatly helped upper class teachers to support the pupils in their academic endeavors" [Date: 12-08-2021, Source: Primary information from key informant]. This statement disclosed that some respondents indeed agreed that the failing rate is reducing in Global Partnership for Education Projects Schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

There is significant evidence from Table above that teachers are involved in decision making (91.4%). A small portion of (2.9%) disagreed and (5.7%) preferred to be non-committal on this statement. The mean score = 4.33 which was faraway above the composite mean score=3.62 reveals that the majority of the respondents conceded that indeed teachers are involved in decision making. From this analysis of the result, an interpretation can be made that teacher are involved in decision making in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts probably as those closest to pupils can significantly contribute towards providing high quality services to pupils and the school community.

The above result concurs with studies that were carried out by Muller & Jugdev, 2002; Patanakul, 2005; and White (2006) who opined that in project management environment, there are several factors that contribute to project performance also identified as Critical Performance Factors (CPFs) such as behavior, terms, and variable which could result in major impact on the project performance when implemented and monitored to sustain results. In addressing Education project performance, it is observed that the impact of context on which factors are considered most critical for assessing project performance are those that may contribute to success or failure (Muller & Jugdev (2012). Nevertheless, most studies in the education sector focus on the traditional 'Iron triangle' which encompass scope, cost, quality and schedule (Walker, 2002). This implies that the quality and schedule i.e. involvement of teachers in decision making while planning for the expected content is a key indicator of performance, cost of delivering the education has to be a concern of the educators by answering the question of whether there is a detail concern on apportioning the right cost to deliver the best education. Therefore, the quality of the education delivered is also very key and the timely delivery of the education in terms of completion rates in the education cycle is also a concern [44,47].

Results further demonstrate that the majority (92.8%) of the respondents acknowledge that Teachers are confident in executing their work. A small portion (2.9%) disagreed with the statement and (4.3%) preferred to be non-committal with the statement. The mean score = 4.31 which was faraway above the composite mean score=3.62 revealed that the majority of the respondents accepted that Teachers are confident in executing their work. From this scrutiny of the result, an interpretation can be made that Teachers are confident in executing their work in Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts probably because teachers' confidence can improve their overall effectiveness as well as their wellbeing in the school and community.

The respondents' opinions were also sought on teachers' satisfaction with the quality of GPE training. The results revealed a mixed reaction to the statement with the majority of the respondents (44.3%) being non-committal to the statement. Nevertheless, a mediocre percentage of (44.3%) agreed while (11.4%) refuted the statement. This result implies that a discontentment prevails among teachers concerning the quality of GPE training; possibly due to inability of the training team to listen to the needs of the teachers. The mean score = 3.37 which was faraway below the composite mean score=3.62 exposed that the majority of the respondents refuted that the teachers were satisfied with the quality of GPE training.

Similarly, concerning management being satisfied with quality of GPE training, the results show a mixed response to the statement with a moderate percentage (47.1%) of the respondents agreeing (strongly agree and agree) to the statement. However, almost half (45.7%) of the respondents prefer being non-committal and

only (7.1%) disagreed with the statement. Sincere the teachers' satisfaction with the quality of GPE training was not good, it is credible to presume that management was not satisfied with quality of GPE training perhaps due to trainers not keeping the promises and poor customer service. Following this statement, an analysis of interview data was carried out by the researcher which revealed that some respondents were not satisfactory. When one key informant Code named GPE-07 at Kowutulai Primary School in Bukedea districts was asked to comment on management being satisfied with quality of GPE training, he had this to say:

"Further training of staff is needed to improve on teaching/learning process in my school". "…some of the teachers that attended the GPE training session revealed to me that there is need for the trainers to engage with the trainees on face-to-face dialogue so as to understand and draft a detailed session time table to address their challenges" [Date: 12-08-2021, Source: Primary information from key informant]. This statement disclosed that some respondents indeed refuted that Management was satisfied with quality of GPE training in Global Partnership for Education Projects Schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

There is significant evidence from the results that all teachers did not receive training. Results likewise suggest that all management did not receive training, probably due to lack of time and resource emanating from the funders. Results show that the Teachers are using the knowledge gained for better teaching (70%). Similarly, the results further demonstrate that the majority (87.1%) of the respondents concede that staff participate in the improvement of school performance. A small percentage of (12.9%) preferred to be non-committal on this statement. The decent mean score = 4.03 which was faraway above the composite mean score=3.62 revealed that the majority of the respondents coincided that staff participate in the improvement of school performance. From this analysis of the result, an interpretation can be made that staff participate in the improvement of school performance in the Global Partnership for Education Projects schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts probably due to the confidence and good knowledge obtained during the GPE training sessions.

Table above also shows that majority of respondents (90%) conceded that staff engage more with learners in a creative manner. However, the remaining (10%) preferred to be non-committal to the statement. This implies that teaching is done in a novel and useful way that promotes pupil growth and linked with the development of original thoughts and actions. The finding is consistent with Michubu, Nyerere, and Kyalo (2017) who pointed out that performance of education projects means that certain expectations for stakeholders, implementers and project beneficiaries are met, in an efficient and effective manner. However, these project performance expectations need to be assessed through a monitoring lens by assessing the practices and establish the extent to which each practice contributes to improved performance (Ika, 2012) [26].

M & E Assessments on the Performance of GPE Projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts

The Empirical objective sought to assess the extent to which monitoring and evaluation assessments influences Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts. The respondents' opinions were sought and the Table below provides the summary of the respondents' views.

Table 6: Distribution of M & E Assessment on the Performance of GPE projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts

M & E Assessments statements	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD
Organisation has baseline plan for all the projects	3 (4.3%)	22 (31.4%)	43 (61.4%)	2 (2.9%)	3.63	0.618
Baseline data is collected for all the projects	7 (10%)	19 (27.1%)	41 (58.6%)	3 (4.3%)	3.57	0.734
Baseline data is used to set targets for projects	1 (1.4%)	24 (34.3%)	37 (52.9%)	8 (11.4%)	3.74	0.674
Baseline data is used to compare project performance	0%	21 (30%)	39 (56.5%)	9 (13%)	3.83	0.641
The organisation has a plan for routine monitoring	0%	8 (11.4%)	48 (68.6%)	14 (20%)	4.09	0.558
The organisation has a template for collecting data and reporting during routine monitoring	0%	11 (15.7%)	42 (60%)	17 (24.3%)	4.09	0.631
The organisation conducts routine monitoring	2 (2.9%)	15 (21.4%)	42 (60%)	11 (15.7%)	3.89	0.692
Data for routine monitoring is used to improve project performance	0%	13 (18.6%)	46 (65.7%)	11 (15.7%)	3.97	0.589
The organisation has a plan for periodic evaluations	1 (1.4%)	11 (15.7%)	53 (75.7%)	53 (75.7%)	3.89	0.526

The organisation conducts periodic evaluations at the specific periods	3 (4.3%)	22 (31.4%)	40 (57.1%)	5 (7.1%)	3.67	0.675
Evaluations are conducted independently by external	5 (7.1%)	21 (30%)	41 (58.6%)	3 (4.3%)	3.60	0.689
Evaluations are conducted independently by internal	2 (2.9%)	17 (24.3%)	46 (65.7%)	5 (7.1%)	3.77	0.618
Evaluations are conducted independently by internal & eternal	1 (1.4%)	23 (32.9%)	40 (57.1%)	6 (8.6%)	3.73	0.635
Data from the evaluation reports are used to generate learning	1 (1.4%)	19 (27.1%)	42 (60%)	8 (11.4%)	3.81	0.644
Composite Mean and Standard Deviation					3.64	0.637

Source: Primary Data (2021)

The results in the Table above show some moderate degree of existence of a fair M & E assessment - Performance of GPE project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts relationship. On whether organisations have baseline plans for all the projects, out of 70 respondents, 2(2.9%) strongly agreed, 43(61.4%) agreed, 22(31.4%) were not sure, while 3(4.3%) disagreed with the statement. This implies that a moderate number of respondents 45(64.3%) agreed that organisations have baseline plans for all the projects. This is reflected in the mean of 3.63 which is slightly above the composite mean of 3.64. This result may probably imply that baseline plans have not been fully implemented in GPE project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts. Aan analysis of Focus Group Discussion data was carried out by the researcher which revealed that some respondents were not satisfactory. When one key informant Code named GPE-010 at St. Aloysious Kodike Prison Primary School in Bukedea districts was asked to comment on what is not working well, he had this to say:

"There is lack of baseline plans and they rely on external exams to assess pupils" [Date: 12-09-2021, Source: Primary information from Focus Group Discussion]. This declaration disclosed that some respondents indeed refuted that organisation have baseline plans for all the projects in the GPE Project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

As to whether Baseline data are collected for all the projects, out of 70 respondents, 3(4.3%) strongly agreed, 41(58.6%) agreed, 19(27.1%) indicated not sure, while 7(10%) disagreed with the statement. This implies that a moderate number of respondents 44(62.9%) agreed that Baseline data are collected for all the projects. This is reflected in the mean of 3.57 which is slightly below the composite mean of 3.64. This result probably reveals that baseline data have not been fully collected for all the projects in GPE project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

There is significant evidence that in GPE project schools where Baseline data are collected, the data are used to set targets for projects. This is reflected in the mean score of 3.74 which is above the composite mean of 3.64. Results also show that in GPE project schools where Baseline data are used to set targets for projects, the data are also used to compare project performance. This is reflected in the mean score of 3.83 which is faraway above the composite mean of 3.64. Aan analysis of interview data was carried out by the researcher which revealed that some respondents were not satisfactory. When one key informant Code named GPE-012 at St. Aloysious Kodike Prison Primary School in Bukedea districts was asked to comment on how the schools are monitored, he had this to say:

"In some schools, targets have been set and staff are encouraged to work towards the set project targets. However, this rarely done in most schools" [Date: 11-09-2021, Source: Primary information from key informant]. This declaration disclosed that some respondents indeed refuted that organisation have baseline plans for all the projects in the GPE Project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

When the respondents were asked as to whether the organisations have plans for routine monitoring, results show that out of 70 respondents, 14(20%) strongly agreed, 48(68.6%) agreed while 8(11.4%) indicated not sure with the statement. This result reveals that the majority 62(88.6%) agreed that the organisations have plans for routine monitoring. This is mirrored in the mean score of 4.09 which is faraway above the composite mean of 3.64. This result may probably imply that M&E officers are able to know whether progress is being made against the agreed plans, so they can address challenges as they occur. This finding concedes with studies by Marelize, Goergens and Jody (2010) who noted that M&E assessment as a practice looks at what organisations plan to do after project planning stage and this assessment will look at routine monitoring which assesses achievement of results at activity level and output levels and evaluations assessing results at outcome and impact level.

The Table above revealed that out of 70 respondents, 17(24.3%) strongly agreed, 42(60%) agreed while 11(15.7%) indicated not sure with the statement. This result reveals that the majority 59(84.3%) agreed that the organisations have templates for collecting data and reporting during routine monitoring. This is echoed in the mean score of 4.09 which is faraway above the composite mean of 3.64 perhaps.

The results further indicate that majority of the respondents 53(75.7%) concurred (agree and strongly agree) that the organisations conduct routine monitoring. However, 2(2.9%) refuted the statement and 15(21.4%) preferred to be non-committal to the statement. This reveals M & E Assessments in action at GPE project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

The respondents' views were sought on whether Data for routine monitoring are used to improve project performance. The results show that out of 70 respondents, 11(15.7%) strongly agreed, 46(65.7%) agreed while 13(18.6%) indicated not sure with the statement. This result reveals that the majority 57(81.4%) agreed that Data for routine monitoring are used to improve project performance. This is reflected in the mean score of 3.97 which is faraway above the composite mean of 3.64. This result may probably imply that data collection by the M&E officers is key to improving project performance in GPE project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts.

There is also significant evidence that the organisations have plans for periodic evaluations. This is reflected with the mean score of 3.89 which is above the composite mean of 3.64. Results also show that because organisations have plans for periodic evaluations, they are in position to conduct periodic evaluations at the specific periods. This is reflected in the mean score of 3.67 which is above the composite mean of 3.64.

Considering as to whether evaluations are conducted independently by external, results show that out of the 70 respondents, 3(4.3%) strongly agreed, 41(58.6%) agreed, 21(30%) indicated not sure while 5(7.1%) disagreed with the statement. This result reveals a moderate number of 44(62.9%) agreeing that evaluations are conducted independently by external. This result may probably imply that evaluations are not fully conducted independently by external in some GPE project schools in Katakwi and Bukedea districts. However, there is evidence that evaluations are conducted independently by internal. This is reflected in the mean score of 3.77 which is above the composite mean of 3.64.

There is significant evidence from Table above that Evaluations are conducted independently by internal & eternal. The results illustrate that out of 70 respondents, 6(8.6%) strongly agreed, 40(57.1%) agreed, 23(32.9%) indicated not sure while 1(1.4%) disagreed with the statement. This result reveals that the majority 46(65.7%) agreed that Evaluations are conducted independently by internal & eternal. This is reflected in the mean score of 3.73 which is above the composite mean of 3.64.

Lastly, the respondents' views were sought on whether data from the evaluation reports are used to generate learning. The results indicated that out of 70 respondents, 8(11.4%) strongly agreed, 42(60%) agreed, 19(27.1%) indicated not sure while only 1(1.4%) disagreed that data from the evaluation reports are used to generate learning. This result discloses that the majority of the respondents 50(71.4%) agreed that data from the evaluation reports are used to generate learning.

Regression Analysis for M & E Assessments on GPE projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts

Regression Analysis of M & E Assessments and Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts was done and generated as illustrated in Table below.

Table 7: M & E Assessments and Performance of GPE projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts

ANOVAa							
Model		**Sum of Squares**		**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	2.550		1	2.550	34.421	.000[b]
	Residual	5.037		68	.074		
	Total	7.587		69			
R-squared = 0.336 Adj R-squared = 0.326							
Coefficientsa							
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B
1		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound / Upper Bound
	(Constant)	1.700	.330		5.157	.000	1.042 / 2.358
	SMEA	.506	.086	.580	5.867	.000	.334 / .678
a. Dependent Variable: performance of Global Partnership for Education projects							

Source: Primary Data (2021)

Findings from Table above show that M & E Assessments explain variations in Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda. Since the overall model is statically significant, all the beta coefficients are significant.

Test of Hypothesis

With reference to the study objective, the study sought to assess the extent to which monitoring and evaluation Assessments Influences Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda. Thus, the null and alternative hypotheses were:

- **H0:** Monitoring and Evaluation Assessments has no significant influence on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda
- **HA:** Monitoring and evaluation Assessments has a significant influence on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda

This was tested at 95% level of confidence and from the regression analysis as showed from Table above reveals that the statistic, $F(1, 69) = 34.421$, $p < 0.05$, illustrates that the regression model is statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable (performance of Global Partnership for Education projects). The study finding therefore accepts to reject the null hypothesis that Monitoring and evaluation assessments have no significant influence on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda and therefore concludes that that Monitoring and evaluation assessments have significant influence on Performance of Global Partnership for Education projects in Katakwi and Bukedea districts, Uganda.

Discussion of the Findings

This section discusses the findings according to the study objectives. The implications of key findings are analysed according to the opinions of various scholars in order to arrive at a conclusion on the subject matter.

The study found a positive influence between M & E Assessments and the performance of GPE projects in public primary schools. It was found out that increased templates for collecting data and reporting during routine monitoring results to an increase in performance of GPE projects in public primary schools. This finding coincides with Kyalo, Nyerere and Michubu (2017) who opined that assessment of sustainability requires monitoring and evaluation throughout the life cycle of a project and requires commitment from the many different bodies involved. Having the right templates for collecting data and reporting during monitoring of results increases performance of a project.

This view is supported by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness which was an international agreement to continue to increase efforts for managing aid to developing countries also emphasized that it is important to evaluate projects using monitorable actions and indicators where a set of twelve indicators were developed to help track and encourage progress toward attaining more effective aid (OECD, 2005). The indicators and targets that were endorsed are organized around five key principles to include; Ownership, Alignment, Harmonization, managing for results and Mutual accountability as mentioned by Joint (2005).

The study discovered that organisations practice the act of incorporating the M&E roles in the job descriptions of non-M&E staff increasing greater transparency and accountability on the performance of the GPE project. This finding concedes with studies by Kyalo and Nyonje (2015) who posited that successful development projects today are grounded in careful planning, rigorous data collection, meticulous implementation, and thorough incorporating the M&E roles in the job descriptions to make efficient use of donor money. Likewise, Nyonje, Ndunge and Mulwa (2012) supplement the above analogy opining that one of the greatest benefits of M & E Assessments is helping organisations to track, analyse and report on relevant information and data throughout the life cycle of a project, thus promoting performance of organisations [33].

The study further established that the organisations have baseline plans for all the projects and utilize baseline plans to compare project performance. This study best conceptualizes M & E assessment of projects as power to explain performance through tracking and assessment of the projects using baseline plans. The above finding is consistent with the views of Kyalo, Mulwa, Mbugua and Obare (2016) who opined that M&E assessment as a practice looks at what organisations do after project planning stage and sets baseline plans which assist in collecting data for all the projects thus making achievement of results at activity level and output levels easy.

The study finding is aligned to view that the process of conducting a readiness assessment should be the first step in designing a results-based M&E system. It evaluates the ability and willingness of development partners and governments to develop the system. The assessment process evaluates the presence and/or absence of champions including barriers to projects, organizational capacity, roles and responsibilities as well as incentives. The implication is that assessment ensures that organisations prepare adequately in terms of planning for the resources needed to implement the project and also work on the incentives' structure to keep people motivated to implement then finally all people know what to do technically to avoid having people without expertise, limit duplication of duties and remove any barriers to achievement of results. Saunders confirms that assessment is vital information to help management make decisions on the project at the planning stage, which makes assessments vital as an M&E practice for project performance [9-12,31,38].

Conclusion

It is agreeable to note that Monitoring and Evaluation Assessment in the context of this study greatly influence the performance of GPE projects in public primary schools. M&E assessment has a positive influence on performance, according to this study. It can also be concluded that, in the context of this study, M & E Assessment is the most critical M&E component in the performance of GPE projects in public primary schools in Bukedea and Katakwi districts. Therefore, it is recommended that for performance of GPE projects in public primary schools, Routine programme monitoring as a component of M&E systems should be prioritized when selecting M&E practices for public primary schools [27-30,34,35,39,48,49].

Reference

1. Alqahtani F, Chinyio E, Mushatat S, Oloke D (2015) Factors effecting performance of projects: A conceptual framework. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research 6: 670-676.
2. Gunduz M, Almuajebh M (2020) Critical Success Factors for Sustainable Construction Project Management. Sustainability 12: 1990.
3. Ika (2012) Project Management for Development in Africa: Why Projects Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It. Project Management Journal 43: 27-41.
4. Prestidge Marelize, Kusek Jody Zall (2010) Making Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Work. A Capacity Development Toolkit. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/708391468331216900/making-monitoring-and-evaluation-systems-work-a-capacity-development-toolkit.
5. Nyonje J , Moses Aol Jabuya (2016) Influence of School Administration's Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures on Utilization of Education Subsidy in Public Secondary Schools Kisumu County Kenya. Overtime since its inception disparities in effective utilization of education subsidy 8.
6. Ile I U, Eresia-Eke C, Allen-Ile O K (2012) Monitoring and evaluation of policies, programmes and projects. Van Schaik 338.
7. Kyalo N D, Nyerere J K, Michubu M (2017) Learner Support Services and Quality ofEducation in Public Universities in

Kenya. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences 8022-8030.
8. Ralf Müller, Kam Jugdev (2012) Critical success factors in projects: Pinto, Slevin, and Prescott – the elucidation of project success. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business 5: 757-775.
9. Ryan T, French S, Kennedy G (2019) Beyond the Iron Triangle: improving the quality of teaching and learning at scale. Studies in Higher Education 1-12.
10. West M R, Henderson M, Peterson P E (2012) The education iron triangle. In the Forum De Gruyter 10.
11. Mwesigye A (2015) The advent of universal primary education (UPE) in Uganda: challenges and possible solution. Journal of Educational Research and Studies 3: 1-12.
12. UNESCO (2015) Education for all 2000-2015: Achievements and Challenges. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015. Paris, France. Publication by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization 499. https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/efa-achievements-challenges.
13. The World Bank (2021) UG Teacher and School Effectiveness Project. https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P133780.
14. Busingye J D, Najjuma R (2015) Do learning and teaching materials influence learning outcomes amidst high enrolments? Lessons from Uganda's universal primary education. Africa Education Review 12: 109-126.
15. Matinda S, Ochieng D J P, Weatherholt T, Nabacwa R, Crouch L, et al. (2018) Uganda Early Years Study. Milestones 3 Final Report. RTI International, Triangle Park, USA. http://iercpublicfiles.s3.amazonaws.com/public/resources/DFID%20repetition%20in%20Uganda%20final%20report.pdf.
16. UNICEF (2018) Quality of Basic Education. https://www.unicef.org/uganda/what-we-do/quality-education.
17. Weatherholt T, Jordan R, Crouch L, Barnett E, Pressley J (2019) Challenge and drivers of over-enrolment in the early years of primary school in Uganda. International Journal of Early Childhood 51: 23-40.
18. Adams K M, Hester P T, Bradley J M, Meyers T J, Keating C B (2014) Systems theory as the foundation for understanding systems. Systems Engineering 17: 112-123.
19. Luhmann N, Baecker D, Gilgen P (2013) Introduction to systems theory. Cambridge: Polity. https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=introduction-to-systems-theory--9780745645711
20. Dekkers R (2015) Applied systems theory. Zurich, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing 1-14.
21. Melanie Killen, Kelly Lynn Mulvey, Aline Hitti (2009) Social exclusion in childhood and adolescence. Guilford Pres 84: 772-790.
22. Cresswell (2012) Challenges Facing Mobile Schools among Nomadic Pastoralists: A Case Study of Turkana County,. American Journal of Educational Research 4: 22-32.
23. Kothari C R, Garg G (2014) Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. 3rd ed. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited 8: 2020.
24. Cohen L, Manion L, Morrison K (2018) Research methods in education. London: Routledge 12: 944.
25. Lakshmi S, Mohideen M A (2013) Issues in Reliability and Validity of Research. International journal of management research and reviews 3: 2752.
26. Roberts R (2016) Understanding the validity of data: A knowledge-based network underlying research expertise in scientific disciplines. Higher Education 72: 651-668.
27. Heale R, Forbes D (2013) Understanding triangulation in research. Evidence-based nursing 16: 98.
28. Triangulation D S (2014) The use of triangulation in qualitative research. In Oncology nursing forum 41: 545.
29. Tavakol, Dennick (2011). Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha. International Journal of Medical Education 27: 53-55.
30. Chigangacha P S, and Haupt T C (2014) Effectiveness of client involvement in construction projects: A contractor perspective. ASOCSA 11th Built Environment ConferenceAt: Durban 6: 249-266.
31. Babatunde O A (2020) Quantitative Research Methods. Research Gate 1: 1-15.
32. Coopers H, Schindler R (2018) Research Methodology. International Journal of Management Sciences 1: 1-15.
33. Kyalo Mulwa S, Mbugua J, Obare J (2016) Implementation Process of Project Control Systems and Performance of Rural Roads Construction Projects in Kenya: Role of Project Team Experience Diversity. European Scientific Journal 12. DOI: 10.19044/esj.2016.v12n29p408.
34. Walker M P, Brakefield T, Morgan A, Hobson J A, Stickgold R (2002) Practice with sleep makes perfect: sleep-dependent motor skill learning. Neuron 35: 205-211.
35. Joyce Fortune, Diana White (2006) raming of project critical success factors by systems model. International Journal of Project Management 24: 53-65.
36. Michubu Nyerere, Kyalo (2017) Learner Support Services and Quality of Education in Public Universities in Kenya. Quality of higher education in Kenya. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences 4: 19-24.
37. Nyonje R, Kyalo D N (2012) Monitoring and Evaluation of project and programmes. University of Nairobi.
38. Newcomer K E, Hatry H P, Wholey J S (2015) Handbook of practical program evaluation. John Wiley & Sons. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781119171386.
39. Saunders R P (2015) Implementation monitoring and process evaluation. Sage Publications. https://www.amazon.in/Implementation-Monitoring-Process-Evaluation-Saunders/dp/148330809X.
40. Effective States and Exclusive Development (ESID) (2016) From schooling to learning: Is Uganda committed to increasing the quality of basic education? ESID Briefing No. 20. https://www.effective-states.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/briefing_papersfinal-pdfsesid_bp_20_education-quality-Uganda.pdf.
41. Global Partnership for Education (GPE) (2020) Summative Evaluation of GPE's Country-Level Support to Education: Batch 5, Country 19: Uganda. Final Report-February 2020. Quebec. https://www.globalpartnership.org/sites/default/files/document/file/2020-04-summative-evaluation-gpe-country-level-support-to-education-uganda.pdf.
42. Global Partnership for Education (GPE) (2021) GPE Impact. https://www.globalpartnership.org/results/gpe-impact.
43. Global Partnership for Education (GPE). (2014) About GPE. http://www.globalpartnership.org/aboutGPE.
44. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) (2021) UTSEP/GPE Project. http://www.education.go.ug/utsep-gpe-project/.
45. Ralf Müller, Kam Jugdev (2012) Critical success factors in projects: Pinto, Slevin, and Prescott – the elucidation of project success. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business 5: 757-775.
46. Mwesigye A (2015) The advent of universal primary education (UPE) in Uganda: challenges and possible solution. Journal of Educational Research and Studies 3: 1-12.
47. Neuman W L (2013) Social research methods: Qualitative and

quantitative approaches. Harlow: Pearson education. https://letrunghieutvu.yolasite.com/resources/w-lawrence-neuman-social-research-methods_-qualitative-and-quantitative-approaches-pearson-education-limited-2013.pdf.

48. OECD/UNDP (2014) Making development Cooperation More Effective:2014 Progress Report. Paris:OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/publications/making-development-co-operation-more-effective-9789264209305-en.htm.
49. Results Education Fund (2014) Greater Impact Through Partnership: 8 Reasons to Invest in the Global Partnership for Education Now More Than Ever. Washington. http://www.results.org/wp-content/uploads/Greater_Impact_Through_Partnership_-_8_Reasons_to_Invest_in_the_Global_Partnership_for_Education_Now_More_Than_Ever.pdf.