

The Professionalization of Evaluation in Nigeria: The Barriers and Challenges in Conducting Evaluation in Nigeria and the Role of NAE

Victor A. Malaolu¹, Jonathan E. Ogbuabor^{2*}

¹ Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Officer, Engage Citizens Pillar, DFID Partnership To Engage, Reform and Learn

² Department of Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

*Corresponding Author:

Jonathan E. Ogbuabor

Email: jonathan.ogbuabor@unn.edu.ng

Abstract: This paper examined the barriers/challenges facing the evaluation profession in Nigeria and the role of the Nigerian Association of Evaluators (NAE) towards improving the profession. The paper also draws lessons from other African countries on how to improve evaluation practice in Nigeria. The findings indicate that paucity of evaluation skill, partial implementation of national monitoring and evaluation systems, lack of monitoring and evaluation ownership, non-utilization of evaluation results and funding are the main barriers/challenges confronting evaluation conduct in Nigeria. The paper therefore recommends that the NAE should improve the technical capacity of evaluation practitioners in Nigeria; organize workshop for cross learning and experience sharing among practitioners; supporting monitoring and evaluation ownership and canvass for utilization of evaluation results. The paper finds from cross country analysis that institutionalizing the evaluation of public policies is a veritable step towards a National Evaluation Policy in Nigeria, which will promote good monitoring and evaluation practice in the country. Overall, we recommend that policy makers in Nigeria should aim to use evaluation in improving the effectiveness of public policies.

Keywords: Professional Evaluation; Public Policy; Nigeria, JEL Codes: O19; O21; N17

INTRODUCTION

Expansion of interest in evaluation began during the 1980s as international agencies began institutionalizing evaluation and evaluation units were set up, not only in the United States, but also in Europe, mainly as an accountability tool to satisfy public opinion and the government's need to know how public aid funds were used [1]. Consequently, monitoring and evaluation gained wide acceptance recently as practice both in developed and developing countries and evaluation particularly is constantly receiving increased attention and interest around the World. Donor agencies now perceive it as yardstick for judging implementation capacity of project management. This is because there is need to derive satisfaction from the performance of development programmes being implemented, especially in the wake of worsening poverty levels, malnutrition, low living standards, ill health, prevalence cases of HIV/AIDS among other challenges gave birth to the issue of monitoring and evaluation. Also because evaluations often required for accountability, to find out whether programme managers are using limited resources in the ways planned and bringing about the intended results. This is premised on the fact that expected different projects and programmes delivery has not been met. Given that evaluation has become one of the most important topics in development parlance and in project management, this paper seeks to resolve the following questions: what are the challenges

confronting the evaluation profession in Nigeria? What roles can NAE play to improve the evaluation profession in Nigeria? What lessons can be drawn from neighboring countries on how to improve evaluation practice in Nigeria? Accordingly, the objectives of this paper are threefold: to identify the challenges confronting evaluation practice in Nigeria; to identify the roles of NAE towards improving evaluation practice in Nigeria; and to draw lessons from other neighboring countries on how to improve evaluation practice in Nigeria. The study is significant because evaluation in Nigeria stills an evolving process and yet it faces difference barriers and challenges which could hinder its advancement. Knowing the difficulties will provides better understand on how to mitigate against them and subsequent improve evaluation practice in Nigeria. The primary function of M&E is to provide pointers on how to do things better through a better understanding of what works and what does not. Monitoring is defined as a continuous assessment both of the functioning of the project activities in the context of implementation schedules and of the use of project inputs by targeted population in the context of design expectations. World Bank [2] define monitoring as a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of

allocated funds. In other word, monitoring refers to collecting information on a project regularly and analyzing it to find out how it is progressing. Evaluation on the other hand is define as episodic (not continuous as the case with monitoring usually midterm and at end of the project) assessment of an ongoing or completed project to determine its actual impact against the planned impact (strategic goal or objectives for which it was implemented) efficiency, sustainability, effectiveness [3]. UNDP [4] define it as a rigorous and independent assessment of either completed or ongoing activities to determine the extent to which they are achieving stated objectives and contributing to decision making. UNDP [4] summarized the purposes of evaluation as: to improve performance and achieve results, measure and assess performance in order to effectively manage the outcomes and outputs of development results, to focuses on assessing the contribution of various factors to a given development outcome with such factors including outputs, partnerships, policy advice and dialogue, advocacy and brokering/ coordination and to determine whether the effects of the project are intended or unintended and whether the results are positive or negative to the target. The importance of evaluation is to assess the relative success of program in meeting the stated objectives and also to identify what can be improved in the plan or program. Evaluation helps one to understand change,

both anticipated and unanticipated, and plan for what happens next. It does this by establishing why the level of performance is being achieved, what difference is being made, what has been learned, and what to do next in the implementation of a policy or programme. [5]

Evaluation Practices across Some African Countries

Unlike the developed countries evaluation practices across the Africa countries has not been so impressive. For instance, in Ghana, Kenya and Senegal, there is evaluation capacity in the country which is applied to evaluations of government projects, but without a national system. In Ghana's case, evaluation predominantly remains a practice undertaken outside of government. For example, evaluation accounted for less than 3% of the overall spending on M&E in 2010/2011 [6]. In Senegal, it is reported that evaluations are undertaken in alignment with donor project cycles and appear to be undertaken mainly to fulfil the routine evaluation requirements of those donors. However, there is evidence of an emerging demand for evaluation in three countries (Uganda, Benin and South Africa); in other countries there is local evaluation capacity but there is no national system. The only country in Africa according to Porter and Goldman [5] that is investing significantly in evaluation is Morocco, which recently began to develop the use of evaluation for parliament.

Table-1: Characteristics Features of few African Countries M&E system

Benin		Ghana	
Opportunities	Challenges	Opportunities	Challenges
National M&E system is organized around a chain of parties which carry out planning, programming, budgeting (PPBS), and monitoring and evaluation. M&E mechanism relies on the national statistics system for measurement and data. • A high level of political support for M&E • Existence of the necessary structures for M&E	Lack capacity building for staff to keep up to date and to promote the adoption of new tools. Lack quality statistical data • Reinforcement of capacities for the work • The legal mandate for M&E • Linkages with the public • Planning of detailed activities for M&E	Widening M&E beyond the executive arm of government • Develop national consensus on communication model of M&E linked to centrally accepted theory of change • Linking M&E to national development planning with M&E at the level of public administration	• Financial and technical resources to strengthen capacity and motivate personnel to commit to performing their functions • Reconciliation of group interest and sectorial aspirations • Public institutions focusing on their core functions
Burundi		Kenya	
Opportunities	Challenges	Opportunities	Challenges
Structure within the presidency • Past volatility and now stability for new system • All parties can be involved in M&E	M&E management is fragmented in government • Capacity for the collection of statistics is limited • Lack of finances for M&E • The commitment of sector ministers and from services that have been decentralized	Grading system for performance • Linking M&E to budgeting • More focus on evaluation • Leadership championing M&E at the top • Simple reliable and frequent assessments	Legal mandate • Human and financial capacity • Championship at the top level • Reconciling evidence with reports • Resistance to M&E • Cultural barriers to sharing M&E results • Non-confrontational culture

Uganda		Senegal	
Opportunities	Challenges	Opportunities	Challenges
Approval of the M&E policy • Strong political will and support • Good will from DPs. • Strong M&E and Technical Working Group • Strong institutional arrangement • Barazas – citizen based monitoring • Increased demand for evaluations	Political will and sustainability • Human resources and capacity gap • Failure to appreciate the role of M&E • Lack of adequate finances	Affirmation of M&E in the Constitution • Existence of research institutions • Reforms underway of a number of institutions • The system has demonstrated capacity	Coherence of the system • Institutional framework for M&E • Financing of M&E • Utilization of evaluation methodologies • Systemization of ex-ante evaluations • Diffused manner in which evaluations are utilized
South Africa			
Opportunity		Challenges	
Political commitment and enabling environment • Opportunity to influence public sector reform • M&E is on national agenda • Link with National Productivity Institute • Develop the concept of programmes • Learn from others • Rationalize reporting roles and responsibilities • Practical technical mechanism to build alliances and strong work relationships		• Lack of hands-on political leadership & sustainability • Stakeholders not clear about what M&E system trying to achieve • Fragmented and poor data systems • Lack of coherence and consistency across national government • High expectations for M&E to deliver quickly • Lack of M&E culture and skills • Strengthen M&E in local government	

Extracted from African Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Workshop Report 2013

From the summary of characteristic feature of some African countries M&E system presented in table above revealed the countries have different opportunities and challenges with the existence or non-existence of good structured M&E system. In all countries two key challenges for implementing evaluation include invoking demand from government, while also drawing on in-country quality evaluation capacity. In Benin, M&E system is still being developed and faces challenges such as weaknesses in human resources, in monitoring tools, in the generation of statistics, and in the lack of relevant national training. In Ghana, most M&E requirements, especially when it comes to evaluation, are still driven by development partners. The national M&E system still faces several constraints, such as inadequate funding as well as insufficient operational and technical capacity for M&E in the public sector. Coordination of M&E information, especially at the sector level, is also a major challenge. In Senegal, there is a legal and regulatory framework for M&E in existence; however, evaluation practice is limited to financial tracking and a predominance of legal and regulatory control. Also, there is issue of coordination of actors in the evaluation sphere from different branches of power – executive, judicial, regulatory and consultative. Kenya's M&E system still faces challenges at three levels, i.e. human capital, financial and infrastructural. These levels are interdependent and influence each other. Way forward for Kenya was to rely on national M&E policy. In

addition, fundamental changes in Kenya Constitution regarding central and devolved governance structures provide an opportunity for strengthening the country's M&E system. By underscoring timely and accurate information sharing to support policymaking, the Constitution is called for a stronger nation-wide M&E system. This provides the greatest strength and opportunity for the M&E system in Kenya. In South Africa there is an issue of using the power of the Presidency in ways that builds commitment across government and does not promote malicious compliance. Institutionalization requires embedding M&E activities in the culture and day-to-day practice of government. Developing capacity to apply the tools in strategic pockets of the administration and externally to government is a critical challenge for the institutionalization of M&E in SA. In Uganda, M&E system is facing with capacity challenges to design and manage M&E systems that not only cover performance but also track the outcome and impact of service deliver. There is limited on-job training and mentoring in M&E. M&E is still considered as a costly and more or less useful activity; funds are seldom allocated to M&E. For this reason, to improve the country's M&E system, it was proposed that first; M&E should be upgraded to its desired level both in the government and academia. Secondly, institutionalization of M&E as a measure of professionalization of M&E in government should be practiced. Also the need to train staff with basis M&E skills such as data collection and analysis, building of M&E results chains and plans, setting

evaluation questions, report writing, different evaluation methodologies was proposed.

Nigerian Monitoring and Evaluation System

A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework was established to track progress in the implementation of the first National Implementation Plan of 2010-2013 to ensure high performance and accountability. The M&E framework also includes a Performance Contract between the President and the Ministers/Heads of agencies, which is cascaded down the Ministries and Agencies. The M&E system is relatively strong at the national level but much weaker at the state and local government levels, and across other sectors (public, private, and civil society). NACA [7] argues that even though there is a national system, vertical systems continue to exist and these systems are poorly harmonized with the national system in terms of the indicators, data collection tools, and reporting tools that are being used across partners and service delivery areas and there is an issue of poor data use. Nigeria M&E system like other African countries faces peculiar challenges. ADB & World Bank [9] listed many important obstacles to institutionalizing evaluation systems in developing countries, among them to include: poor demand for M&E information and lack of ownership by decision-makers and senior public managers of the idea and system, shortage of evaluation skills and a chasm between mechanisms for evaluation feedback and the actual decision making processes and compromised sustainability, largely owing to insufficient resource commitment.

Barriers/Challenges in Conducting Evaluation in Nigeria

Paucity of Skilled Evaluators

One major challenge in impact evaluation which cut across developing countries including Nigeria is dearth of technical capacity. Since 2000, more than 200 presentations on evaluation capacity building (ECB) have been given at the conferences of the American Evaluation Association (AEA) and Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), and there is a growing literature on it [10]. This is because of its importance to evaluation profession. Conducting impact evaluation is rigorous and it rests on the ability to provide a reliable estimate of the counterfactual since evaluator job is to analyze/quantify the effect of a program on a group of people by comparing the treatment group with control group and how same treatment group would have evolved if they had not received the program. Hence, designing good counterfactual requires innovative methodologies (be it Experimental Methods: Random Control Trial or Quasi experimental Method: Regression discontinuity design (RDD), Difference in Difference Propensity Matching Score and Instrumental Variable), such skill may be lacking. Along with the skill evaluator need to be a rational thinker especially when it comes to issue of attribution, can evaluators think of any plausible explanation other than the

intervention to explain the result of project or how strongly can evaluators rule out explanation(s) other than the intervention to explain the outcome difference made? Answer to this rest on the combination of skill and knowledge of the evaluator. This is in line with submission of Khan [11] that weak institutional and methodological capacities in term of knowledge and skill affect the quality of evaluation findings and, consequently, their credibility in developing countries. Similarly, shortage of evaluation skills was also identified by ADB & World Bank [8] as part of important obstacles to institutionalizing evaluation systems in developing countries.

Partial Implementation of a Result-Based National M&E System

Good M&E Framework put in place can play a major role in enhancing the effectiveness of development programmes and projects in Nigeria. One of the challenges conducting evaluation in Nigeria is partial implementation of National M&E System. The institutional arrangement for M&E in the country is currently not harmonized and there is a challenge in all cases of the streamlining of M&E without a coherent system across different sector. UNICEF [12] maintains that without having strong national evaluation systems in place, development results will not be sustainable, and evaluation will mainly serve external needs as evidenced by several studies.

The submission of NACA [7] has been validated by Darma and Tijjani [13] that there is no national M&E system presently at states and local government level even though it is at infancy at the federal level. This prompted former Ministry of Planning Minister, Dr. Shamsudeen Usman to advised states at a workshop organized in Lagos by Ministry Economic Budget and Planning on designing and implementing a comprehensive Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System to adopt the National Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation in order to deliver transparent and accountable governance. He scored Lagos state high in M&E practices, and praised Ondo, Niger and Cross River states for initiating the process of implementing RBM¹, noting that the National Framework was modelled in line with global best practices. Lagos state government during former governor Fashola administration made an attempt to set up M&E system in the state following the support the state receives from World Bank and DFID through SPARC². The state developed the M&E system which was domicile in the Ministry of Economic Budget and Planning. However, the M&E system was never without a challenge. There was misalignment between the M&E system and state development plan; it was expected that the M&E system will fit into the

¹ Result-Based Monitoring

² State Partnership for Accountability, Responsiveness and Capability

state development plan. But, this did not happen because the M&E system could not fit into the state development planning. Practically, there is an absence of effective use of the M&E system to achieve programme goals and development effectiveness as expected.

Lack of M&E ownership and Non-utilization of Evaluation Results

It has widely demonstrated that there is probability of using evaluation results if decision-makers have a strong sense of “ownership” or belonging. One of the essential elements of successful evaluation is ownership of the M&E process by all by all stakeholders that is sectors, implementing entities, government and donor agency. This is lacking in Nigeria even though there appear to be gesture regarding governments in Nigeria developing stronger endogenous demand for evidence generated from M&E systems. The end product of evaluation result should be to facilitate decision-making by showing how the program operates in practice and the reasons for the effects observed. There is a clear indication of non-use of evaluation findings in Africa including Nigeria. Igbokwe-Ibeto [14], maintains that governmental executives in Nigeria do not make effective use of evaluation as a tool of management. Most developing nations according to Khan [11] are yet to regularly use post-evaluation and similar feedback tools to improve project quality, optimize public investments and achieve transparency and accountability in public sector decision-making. There is always the notion that evaluation is a donor driven activity providing them with few benefits. Sometime report of well executed evaluation with a good result may end up been shelved and ignore due to lack of interest occasion by lack of M&E ownership.

Inadequate Funding

Funding is one the barriers confronting Evaluation in Nigeria. UN suggested that for an M&E systems to survive a minimum budget of 10% of the actual program or project cost at all levels of intervention should be allocated to M&E. Such funds should be disbursed as needed in a timely fashion. Dresden and Burggraf [9] identified lack of financial resources as one of the typical barriers towards an effective use of evaluation. Setting aside some fund for M&E in programme implementation has not been a practice in Nigeria rather the prevailing practice is for donor agency to call for evaluation either at the mid of project cycle or at the end while implementing agency crosses its fingers while in anticipation of outcome of the evaluation.

Roles of NAE towards improving Evaluation Practice in Nigeria

Improving Technical Capacity of Evaluation practitioners in Nigeria

There is an avalanche of literature on the necessity of technical skill for evaluators. Hardlife and Zhou, [15] states that Monitoring and evaluation is a technical field and it demand much of skilled personnel. It is critically important that those engaged in evaluations have the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes to support effective practice; which is evaluation capacity. Although, there is no empirical evidence as regards lack of evaluation capacity in Nigeria even though Kusek and Rist [16] argued that some developing countries currently lack the basic capacity to successfully measure inputs, activities, and outputs. There are different conceptualization of what evaluation capacity building is and the general consensus is that ECB is about building the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of organization members; increasing the sustainability of professional evaluation practice; and, providing adequate resources and motivations to engage in ongoing evaluation work [17-19]. On the other hand, UNICEF [20] stress that evaluation capacity building involves the design and implementation of teaching and learning strategies to help individuals, groups, and organizations learn about what constitutes effective, useful, and professional evaluation practice. The ultimate goal of evaluation capacity building is sustainable evaluation practice where members continuously ask questions that matter, collect, analyze, and interpret data, and use evaluation findings for decision-making and action. For evaluation practice to be sustainable, capacity of evaluators in Nigeria must be developed to provide opportunities to transfer their learning about evaluation to their everyday work. In this regard, NAE can use its network to collaborate with donor agencies /professionals’ body outside Nigeria to constantly support M&E capacity building of its member and the general public who are interested in evaluation practice in Nigeria. NAE can also provide training through workshops and courses, or informally, through working together. For example, circulating copies of a well-done evaluation report of a similar programme can provides evaluation practitioners a concrete idea of what is expected or direction.

Organize Workshop for Cross Learning and Experience Sharing among practitioners

One of the benefits of conducting evaluation is having knowledge of what work and what went wrong which serves as lessons to be learned from both success and failure perspectives, and also looks for best practices which can be applied elsewhere. Therefore, NAE can serve as a hub where evaluators on different programmes/project and other relevant bodies converge to share experience which can serves as feedback and lessons for improvement of programme evaluation and subsequent strengthened the evaluation practice in Nigeria. This validates the submission of Kariuki [21] that evaluators should seek to improve their competencies in order to provide the highest level of performance in their evaluation through workshops, self-study, evaluation of one’s own practice and

working with other evaluators to learn from their skills and experience. Development of such capacities is to assist lesson learning from ongoing or past projects and programs and, through these lessons, to adjust these projects and programs in such a manner that they achieve their planned objectives and/or improve the quality of the design of future projects. In addition, NAE can foster interaction and collaboration between evaluation experts, practitioners and other development stakeholders

Having Good M&E System in Place

In human endeavor, there cannot be any functionality without a system put in place. A coherent M&E system helps to ensure that donor-funded M&E efforts best contribute to national needs rather than simply serving the reporting needs of agencies or legislatures overseas. NAE can help to improve evaluation system in Nigeria by collaborating with international agencies to provide technical support to the National Planning Commission in order to strengthen the existing M&E system at federal level and push across states. The institutionalization of M&E system in Nigeria will enhance performance and professionalization evaluators.

Supporting M&E ownership and Utilization of Evaluation Results

There should be active involvement of key stakeholders such as project managers, policy makers, community members, and program participants in order to increase the usefulness of evaluation results. The role NAE can play in this regard is to embark on awareness campaign and lobby at federal and state level of government in order to stimulate interest of the policy maker and to dilute their illusion regarding seen evaluation business as donor agencies business there by ensuring universal application of evaluation results for decision-making in program implementation and budgeting. NAE can also assist in disseminating M&E results to all stakeholders. Policy makers can then apply the information to pursue evidence-based decision-making.

Solving Funding Issue

As a way forward, there should be budgetary allocations for M&E and also tying fund disbursements for continuing projects and programs to successful achievement of results for every level of implementation; increasing budgetary allocation for good performance; and rewarding evaluators and program personnel for good performance. NAE could use its network to lobby for action on issues affecting funding from donor agencies and government and other stakeholders. Funding incentives will encourage more-rigorous impact evaluations and improve evaluation practice in Nigeria.

Role NAE can play towards improving professionalization of Evaluation in Nigeria

It has been widely argued that there is a weak demand for evaluation in Nigeria. It is suggest that NAE could leverage on existing relationship between key international donor agencies like DFID, UNICEF, UNDP, USAID, World Bank e.t.c and the Nigeria government to lobby the government so that they could consider making provision for budget allocation for M&E, and if such fund is released when needed, it will strengthen evaluation practices in Nigeria as there will be more demand for evaluation. Evaluation Associations all over the World play a crucial role from the local to the international level in professionalization of evaluation. NAE can play a critical role in strengthening and sustaining evaluation capacities providing opportunities for useful dialogue, interaction and learning. NAE can also serve as learning hubs, offer training and access to resources, and encourage support in communities of individuals committed to evaluation. Also, can help donor agencies identify potential evaluation “champions” and evaluators to participate in joint work. NAE as professional associations can also contribute to building an enabling environment for the growth of evaluation culture. NAE as a group of evaluation practitioners can embark on process to define norms and standards that aim at contributing to the professionalization of evaluation in Nigeria. In addition, this could guide the establishment of the institutional framework, management of the evaluation function, conduct and use of evaluations. It can also serves as a reference for the competencies of evaluation practitioners and work ethics, and evaluators can applied as appropriate within their organization. A comprehensive institutional framework for the management of the evaluation function and conduct of evaluations is crucial to ensure an effective evaluation process. Such an institutional framework would promote a culture that values evaluation as a basis for learning in the country and ensures adequate human resources for evaluation in order to allow efficient and effective delivery of services by a competent evaluation function and enable evaluation capacity strengthening. NAE can involve in creating a demand for evaluation by raising awareness and sensitize policy makers and relevant stakeholders on benefits of evaluation which ultimately will promote evaluation practice in the country and subsequent professionalization of evaluation practitioners. Lastly, NAE can contribute towards improving evaluation quality in Nigeria, by promoting increased rigour in design and implementation of evaluation (and evaluation research) through project seminars and trainings.

Lessons from other African countries

There are so many lessons to be drawn from other countries experiences. In general, there was a natural inclination by government towards avoiding evaluations which they viewed with grave suspicion. How it can be beneficial to them in improving policy that affects masses seems to be ambiguous to them. The

picture painted in table 1 suggests a number of factors account for success of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems. The lessons is that a combination of positive factors – such as resource availability (both technical skills and financial), strong political will, structural solidity and strong Monitoring and Evaluation Systems design, all lead to overall success of M&E system. Also, there are numerous technical challenges in the application and institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems as there are also less obvious political challenges to be considered. Though experience according to countries varies and appears in diverse ways yet there are many lessons to learn from their experience. The opportunities available in the few African countries examined shows high level of political support for M&E, existence of the necessary structures for M&E, linking M&E to national development planning with M&E at the level of public administration, linking M&E to budgeting, approval of the M&E policy and putting M&E on national agenda. One key lesson to learn from Nigerian nearest neighbor among the countries is the case of Benin where the process of institutionalizing the evaluation of public policies gave rise to a National Evaluation Policy for public policies. This promotes good M&E practice for the country. The National Evaluation Policy defines the overall framework for planning and carrying out evaluations, and for using the information derived therefrom. The aim was to promote an evaluative culture, the necessary tools to appraise public policies, optimization and rational use of public resources, good use of information, the dissemination of good practice on public management, improved accountability, strengthening of good governance, and finally, more systematic accountability.

CONCLUSION

Evaluation has gained wide acceptance recently as a practice both in developed and developing countries and is constantly receiving increased attention and interest around the World. Given the importance of evaluation in project management in the recent time, this paper examined the challenges in conducting evaluation in Nigeria and identified the role NAE can play to improve professionalization of evaluation. This study reviewed existence literature and complimented it with researcher knowledge of monitoring and evaluation in Nigeria. The paper finds that paucity of evaluation skill, partial implementation of national monitoring and evaluation systems, lack of monitoring and evaluation ownership, non-utilization of evaluation results and funding are the main challenges confronting evaluation conduct in Nigeria. The paper therefore recommends that the NAE should improve the technical capacity of evaluation practitioners in Nigeria; organize workshop for cross learning and experience sharing among practitioners; supporting monitoring and evaluation ownership and canvass for utilization of evaluation results. The paper finds from cross country analysis that institutionalizing the evaluation of public

polices is a veritable step towards a National Evaluation Policy in Nigeria, which will promote good monitoring and evaluation practice in the country. Overall, we recommend that policy makers in Nigeria should aim to use evaluation in improving the effectiveness of public policies.

Acknowledgement: The authors are grateful for useful comments and suggestions received from participants at the 1st National Conference of Nigeria Association of Evaluators in Transcorp Hilton, Abuja, November, 2015

REFERENCES

1. Cleaton-Jones, P., Fatti, P., & Bönecker, M. (2006). Dental caries trends in 5-to 6-year-old and 11-to 13-year-old children in three UNICEF designated regions-Sub Saharan Africa, Middle East and North Africa, Latin America and Caribbean: 1970–2004. *International dental journal*, 56(5), 294-300.
2. Levermore, R. (2011). Evaluating sport-for-development approaches and critical issues. *Progress in development studies*, 11(4), 339-353.
3. McCoy, K. L., Ngari, P. N., & Krumpe, E. E. (2005). Building monitoring evaluation and reporting systems for HIV/AIDS programs.
4. Gleick, P. H. (2002). *Dirty-water: Estimated Deaths from Water-related Diseases 2000-2020*. Oakland: Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security.
5. Porter, S., & Goldman, I. (2013). A growing demand for monitoring and evaluation in Africa. *African Evaluation Journal*, 1(1), 9-pages.
6. Witter, S., Toonen, J., Meessen, B., Kagubare, J., Fritsche, G., & Vaughan, K. (2013). Performance-based financing as a health system reform: mapping the key dimensions for monitoring and evaluation. *BMC health services research*, 13(1), 367.
7. Granich, R., Gupta, S., B Suthar, A., Smyth, C., Hoos, D., Vitoria, M., ... & Bazin, B. (2011). Antiretroviral therapy in prevention of HIV and TB: update on current research efforts. *Current HIV research*, 9(6), 446-469.
8. Kakwani, N., & Pernia, E. M. (2000). What is pro-poor growth?. *Asian development review*, 18(1), 1-16.
9. Burggraf, K., & Gühnemann, A. (2014). Why is monitoring and evaluation a challenge.
10. Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). Insights into evaluation capacity building: Motivations, strategies, outcomes, and lessons learned. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 23(3), 147.
11. Khan, M. A. (1998). Evaluation capacity building: an overview of current status, issues and options. *Evaluation*, 4(3), 310-328.
12. UNICEF. (2007). *The state of the world's children 2008: Child survival* (Vol. 8). Unicef.
13. Darma, N. A., & Tijjani, B. (2014).

- Institutionalizing Development Planning in Nigeria: Context, Prospects and Policy Challenges.
14. Igbokwe-Ibeto, C. J. (2012). Issues and challenges in local government project monitoring and evaluation in Nigeria: The way forward. *European Scientific Journal*, 8(18).
 15. Zhou, G., & Hardlife, Z. (2013). Interrogating the trajectory of Zimbabwe national budgeting. *Global Business and Economics Research Journal*, 2(3), 26-49.
 16. Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: a handbook for development practitioners*. World Bank Publications.
 17. Gibbs, D., Napp, D., Jolly, D., Westover, B., & Uhl, G. (2002). Increasing evaluation capacity within community-based HIV prevention programs. *Evaluation and program Planning*, 25(3), 261-269.
 18. Milstein, B., & Cotton, D. (2000). Defining concepts for the presidential strand on building evaluation capacity. *American Evaluation Association*, Fairhaven, MA.
 19. Hueftle Stockdill, S., Baizerman, M., & Compton, D. W. (2002). Toward a definition of the ECB process: A conversation with the ECB literature. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2002(93), 7-26.
 20. Segone, M., Frankel, N., & Gage, A. (2009). Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems. Better evidence better policies better development results.
 21. Kariuki, J. G. (2014). An Exploration of the Guiding Principles, Importance and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Development Projects and Programmes. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(1).