Do non-profit organizations learn? Evidence from a random sample of NGOs in Uganda[1]

Nathan Fiala and Leticia Riva[2]

October 2017

Abstract

Non-profit organizations have a wide array of tools at their disposal to learn about the implementation and effectiveness of their programs. Do they use these tools to learn about their programming? We survey the directors of a random sample of 182 NGOs operating in Uganda to understand whether and how they conduct monitoring and impact evaluation of their programs. Our data shows that 69% report conducting monitoring and/or impact evaluation of programs. However, this monitoring and impact evaluation is not necessarily leading to learning in the organization since only 36% of the organizations report using the results of these activities to change their programming. We also use a wide array of information on the organizations to observe what correlates with whether the organizations conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluations. We find that organizations that rely on national donors and have received training in monitoring are more likely to conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluation of programs. Number of volunteers and director experience in the organization are negatively associated with conduct these activities. Yearly budget and general size of the organization are not associated with either monitoring or impact evaluation. We end by discussing how the lack of learning that we observe in organizations may provide an important avenue for increase engagement with NGOs by the research and international community.

Keywords: Non-profit organizations; monitoring and evaluation; impact evaluation; organizational learning

1. Introduction

Non-profit and non-governmental organizations (NGOs[3]) deliver a wide array of services and development programs outside of the power of governments. The number of NGOs has increased substantially since the mid-20th century (Boli, 2006; Schofer and Longhofer, 2011). In Uganda, there were over 12,000 organizations registered with the central government in 2015. NGOs around the world can range from local organizations with just one employee to large multi-national organizations, such as the UN, that create partnerships with NGOs and employ thousands of people. Their scope of work is wide and in developing countries account for most of the water, sanitation, health and even income generation programs that citizens receive.

The scale of NGO programming is immense and most organizations believe very strongly in their mission and are committed, at least on paper, to improving outcomes for low income people. However, there is much less evidence for the effectiveness of this programming on recipient welfare than researchers and policy makers would generally like.

In this project, we seek to understand whether NGOs utilize the numerous tools at their disposal to better understand the impact of the work on the lives of participants. That is, do these organizations use these tools to learn about their programming, and how? We explore what characterizes which NGOs utilize monitoring and evaluation (which we refer to as simply monitoring or M&E) and/or impact evaluation methods and whether there is organizational learning after applying these methods. To do so, we conducted a survey with the directors of NGOs in Uganda. From a full list of over 12,000 NGOs registered in Uganda in 2015, we eliminated predominately religious organizations, i.e. churches and we randomly selected a sample of 900 NGOs from which we spoke with the directors of 182 of these organizations.

We find that most NGOs in Uganda do conduct some form of M&E and/or impact evaluation with 69% reporting that conducted these activities in their programs in the past or currently. However, this monitoring and impact evaluation are not necessarily leading to learning in the organization since only 36% of the organizations report using the results of these activities to change their programing.

---

[3] We do not distinguish in this study between whether organizations could be classified as non-profit, non-governmental or civil society organizations. We instead look at all registered development focused organizations in Uganda that operate independently from the government and whose work is not predominately religious based.

We also asked about a wide array of information on the organizations, including their employee structure and education, operating budget and types of donors. We use this information to correlate whether an organization conducts monitoring or impact evaluation with the organization characteristics. We find that organizations that rely on national donors and those that have received training in monitoring are more likely to conduct M&E and/or impact evaluation. Meanwhile, the number of volunteers and experience of directors at the organization is slightly negatively associated with conduct these activities. Yearly budget and general size of the organization are not associated with either monitoring or impact evaluation.

We end by discussing some of the different methods organizations report using for monitoring and/or impact evaluation. The type of monitoring and impact evaluation methods used vary by organization. In our sample, we asked, with an open question, the methods used for monitoring and impact evaluation (see Appendix). We find that the methods explicitly and more frequently mentioned by the NGOs are questionnaires, interviews and internal and external auditors.

The number of tools that organizations can use to measure program effectiveness are growing and becoming more sophisticated and accurate. Monitoring has been a common tool for organizations for decades. While limited, monitoring is an important step for organizations that want to understand whether the programs they are implementing are being delivered to recipients in the ways intended. In the early 2000s, the use of outcome and impact evaluations to measure organizational and program effectiveness increased (Stone and Cutcher-Gershefeld, 2002; Schalock and Bonham, 2003; Sowa et al., 2004; Baruch and Ramalho, 2006; Martin and Kettner, 2009; Packard, 2010), specifically experimental evaluations, like randomized and prospective evaluations, that provide more methodological rigor compared with the older evaluation methods that were almost universally retrospective and non-experimental (Poole et al., 2001; Trevisan, 2007; Ebrahim and Rangan, 2010; Kaplan and Grossman, 2010; Glennerster and Takavarasha, 2013).

NGOs are one of the biggest users of monitoring and impact evaluation methods. Yet, despite the increase attention to evaluations, empirical studies have shown that nonprofit organizations have made only marginal progress in their evaluation practices (Fine et al., 2000; Wiener et al., 2002; Light, 2004; Carman, 2007; Carman and Fredericks, 2010).

There is evidence that there are certain characteristics of NGOs that relate to the use of monitoring and evaluation methods. Studies have found that organizations that are more likely to experiment with monitoring and evaluation are those that are more professionalized (Sahlin-Andersson and Engwall, 2002; Marshall and Suarez, 2014), older and more established (Hailey and Smillie, 2001) and NGOs working in international development as they are receiving more demand for monitoring and evaluation from donors, government aid agencies and foundations (Smith and Gronbjerg, 2006; Brinkerhoff, 2008; MacIndoe and Barman, 2013) or working with other organizations that already conducted monitoring and evaluation (Brown, 1991; Drori et al., 2006; Marshall and Suarez, 2014).

Beyond monitoring and evaluation, there is also increased interest in conducting learning. Evaluations have been found to be used proactively in organizational change, mostly through capacity building and organizational learning (Ebrahim, 2005). But, in practice, even while monitoring and evaluation of programs in different organizations have increased in the last decades, there are still questions whether the results are being used internally to improve services and facilitate learning (Ebrahim, 2002, 2005).

This paper contributes to the literature and policy debate in two key ways. First, most of the research that has been conducted on organizational learning in developing countries is relatively old. Second, our sample was randomly chosen from a list of all registered organizations in Uganda. While the team had difficulties tracking every organization on the list, and so we do not consider this sample to be truly representative, it is not a purely convenience sample and so offers a broader external validity.

This paper proceeds as follows. In section 2 we outline the methods we used to collect information on the organizations. In section 3 we summarize the data and results, including the correlates for whether organizations conduct monitoring, evaluation, and utilize these methods to learn about their programs, and the ways that organizations conduct monitoring and impact evaluation, as expressed to our survey team. Section 4 concludes with policy implications and a discussion on the need for a focus on more organizational learning.

2. Methods

We were provided with a list of all NGOs registered in Uganda by the National NGO Board, which is under the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Uganda requires every NGO in the country to be

registered. This provided us with a list of 12,309 organizations operating in the country. The list includes data on the name of the director, address, telephone number, country of origin, sector, district and region where the organization works in.

However, there were several issues with the data. Many of the fields were not filled in, especially contact information. Most of the organizations were clearly religious, with the sector noted as evangelism or church, and so do not conduct normal programing that would require monitoring or evaluation. We, therefore, dropped all organizations where we were missing contact information and where the primary purpose of the organization was religious. This left us with 3,885 organizations. We then produced a random sample of 400 to contact (10.3% of the full sample).

The local survey team called each organization and asked to speak to the director. It was at this point that the researchers realized that a significant number of the organizations in the dataset either no longer existed, or were not available at the contact information provided. A second random selection of 500 organizations (12.9% of the sample) was then chosen to be contacted. If the organization was unreachable, the research team went online to find websites and social media pages for the organizations. In the end, the survey team was able to interview 182 directors of organizations out of the full sample of 900, a success rate of approximately 20%.

Most of the organizations we could not reach was because phone numbers were not working. This could be due to the organizations changing numbers, or no longer being in operation. None of the missing organizations had a website or social media account. We are not able to confirm what percent of those we could not reach were still in operation, though we speculate it was very few. However, even if all of the organizations existed, the success rate of our survey was relatively high when comparing to other studies that use phone calls to reach respondents. For instance, recent work by Pew (2017) has found significantly decreasing response rates in US phone based opinion surveys, with only a 9%[4] response rate in 2012. Garlick et al. (2017) conduct phone surveys following face-to-face interviews in South Africa and find response rate of around 50%.

The survey team conducted a telephone based questionnaire with the directors of the organizations that we contacted. The questionnaire was developed following literature on evidence-based practice (Aarons et al., 2010; Novins et al., 2013) that allowed us to identify variables that have been found important for implementation of new techniques in organizations.

---

[4] http://www.people-press.org/2012/05/15/assessing-the-representativeness-of-public-opinion-surveys/

The full questionnaire is presented in the Appendix. The questions focused on how the organization conducts M&E, impact evaluation and learning, location of the NGO and year funded, budget and funding, number of employees, education and experience of employees, cooperation with other institutions (academic institutions, community based organizations, etc.). These questions were developed after piloting a phone based questionnaire with directors.

3. Data and results

3.1 Data summary

We present a summary of the data in Table 1. Most of the NGOs in Uganda are funded privately (78%), with international donors representing 39% of the total funding and national donors 14%. On average, the number of temporary and permanent employees are around the same but the number of volunteers double them. Respect to cooperation and partnership, 48% of the NGOs answered that they cooperate with academics, 79% that they cooperate with community based organizations and 63% of them are partners with other NGOs.

We observe that most (69%) NGOs do conduct some form of monitoring and/or impact evaluation However, despite these figures of monitoring and impact evaluation, the number of NGOs that report using the results of these activities to change their programing is only 36% (Table 2). Furthermore, 34% of the NGOs answer that they had training in M&E but they do not conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluation.

We find other differences among NGOs such that NGOs that conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluation, on average, are younger, are bigger in terms of number of employees and create more partnerships with other NGOs than those that do not conduct them. And, meanwhile, both seem to cooperate to the same extent with academics and community organizations.

3.2 Correlates of monitoring and impact evaluation

Table 3 presents the correlates between the characteristics of the organization and whether the organization conducts M&E and/or impact evaluation. We find positive relation between rely on national donors and have received training in monitoring with conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluation of programs. Meanwhile, number of volunteers and experience of the director at the organizations are slightly negatively correlated to conduct these activities. Yearly budget and

general size of the organization based on the number of employees are not associated with either monitoring or impact evaluation.

3.3 How organizations conduct monitoring and impact evaluation

We end by discussing how organizations report conducting monitoring and/or impact evaluation, and how this is related with the organizations characteristics. The techniques to conduct M&E and/or impact evaluation most mentioned in the surveys are interviews (focus groups, field visits, surprise visits and face to face interviews), questionnaires, internal auditors and external auditors.

Those NGOs that use internal auditors have bigger budgets, more employees received training on M&E in the organization respect to those that responded using interviews and external auditors, have less volunteers, create more partnership with other NGOs and have more international donors. NGOs that use questionnaires have more volunteers and have the largest number of employees that received training on M&E.

4. Conclusion

Given the large scope that NGOs play in delivering aid and supporting general development, there is a growing desire among donors and organizations themselves to better understand whether limited funds are being used effectively, and what kinds of impacts their programming have. Knowing this impact is important for the well-being of low income people, and for maintaining a line of funding for NGOs as donors and other stakeholders are increasing their demand for accountability. Monitoring and impact evaluation are two techniques that allow organizations to do exactly this.

Although NGOs today have many tools for monitoring and impact evaluation, the study presented here shows that their implementation is relatively low among NGOs in Uganda. In addition, only a small percentage of those conducting monitoring and/or impact evaluation changed their programming based on the results of these activities, indicating that there is a lack of organizational learning.

An important caveat to the results obtained here is that we are not able to judge the quality of the M&E and impact evaluation conducted by organizations. It is possible that many organizations we spoke have a very loose definition of what M&E or impact evaluation might be

like in practice. These results thus present an upper-bound on what is likely to be the true case of M&E, impact evaluation and general organizational learning.

We believe the results suggest that the current demands of donors and stakeholders in general seem to be insufficient to enforce more precise and transparent evidence of the M&E and impact of programs. This may be due to the lack of sufficient funding to implement them, but our study also shows that Ugandan NGOs appear to have a low level of adaptation to new learning. This lack of organizational learning, that is demonstrated by the fact that most NGOs that conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluation do not change their programming based on their results (those that we would consider more innovative), may be leading the rest of NGOs to not even try to conduct monitoring and/or impact evaluation in the first place. That is, if organizations that conduct M&E and/or impact evaluations are not even using the results of those activities, it would make sense for those organizations save their limited resources for programming instead. This would be an important area for future work.

Given the lack of organizational learning that we observe in this study, it could be beneficial for researchers and international organizations to focus the trainings and other support they provide to these organizations on two core areas: (1) more explicitly explaining how organizations can use M&E and impact evaluations to learn more about their programs and, (2) how to use this information to make changes to that program. This could be done through disseminations of organizational learning techniques and increase discussion of the benefits of having a good environment for organizational learning and the benefits related to the implementation of more accurate and effective techniques to accomplish their missions. Without a clear connection between M&E and impact evaluation and learning, we fear that the benefits from these activities are very limited for organizations.

References

Aarons, G., Hurlburt, M. and Horwitz, S. (2011). Advancing a conceptual model of evidence-based practice implementation in public service sectors. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 38(1), 4-23.

Baruch, Y. and Ramalho, N. (2006). Communalities and distinctions in the measurement of organizational performance and effectiveness across for-profit and nonprofit sectors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *35*(1), 39-65.

Boli, J. (2006). International nongovernmental organizations. In W. W. Powell and R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 333-354). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brinkerhoff, D. (2008). The state and international development management: Shifting tides, changing boundaries and future directions. *Public Administration Review*, *68*(6), 985-1001.

Brown, L. (1991). Bridging organizations and sustainable development. *Human relations*, *44*(8), 807-831.

Carman, J. (2007). Evaluation practice among community-based organizations: Research into the reality. *American Journal of evaluation* 28(1),60-75.

Carman, J. and Fredericks, K. (2010). Evaluation capacity and nonprofit organizations is the glass half-empty or half-full?. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *31*(1), 84-104.

Drori, G., Jang, S. and Meyer, J. (2006). Sources of rationalized governance: Cross-national longitudinal analyses, 1985-2002. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*, 205-229.

Ebrahim, A. (2002). Information struggles: The role of information in the reproduction of NGO-funder relationships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *31*(1), 84-114.

Ebrahim, A. (2005). NGOs and organizational change: Discourse, reporting and learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ebrahim, A. and Rangan, V. (2010). Putting the brakes on impact: a contingency framework for measuring social performance. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2010, No. 1, pp. 1-6). Academy of Management.

Fine, A., Thayer, C. and Coghlan, A. (2000). Program evaluation practice in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 10, 331–339.

Garlick, R., Orkin, K. and Quinn, S. (2017). Call Me Maybe: Experimental Evidence on Using Mobile Phones to Survey Microenterprises Online Appendix.

Glennerster, R., and Takavarasha, K. (2013). Running Randomized Evaluations: A Practical Guide. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hailey, J. and Smillie, I. (2001) Managing for Change: Leadership, Strategy and Management in Asian NGOs, Earthscan Publications: London.

Kaplan, R. and Grossman, A. (2010). The emerging capital market for nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, 88, 1–21.

Light, P. (2004). Sustaining nonprofit performance: The case for capacity building and the evidence to support it. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

MacIndoe, H. and Barman, E. (2013). How organizational stakeholders shape performance measurement in nonprofits: Exploring a multidimensional measure. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *42*(4), 716-738.

Marshall, J. and Suárez, D. (2014). The flow of management practices: An analysis of NGO monitoring and evaluation dynamics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *43*(6), 1033-1051.

Martin L. and Kettner P. (2009). Measuring the Performance of Human Service Programs. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Novins, D., Green, A., Legha, R. and Aarons, G. (2013). Dissemination and implementation of evidence-based practices for child and adolescent mental health: A systematic review. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 52(10), 1009-1025.

Packard, T. (2010). Staff perceptions of variables affecting performance in human service organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *39*(6), 971-990.

Pew Research Center (2017). What Low Response Rates Mean for Telephone Surveys.

Poole, D., Davis, J., Reisman, J. and Nelson, J. (2001). Improving the quality of outcome evaluation plans. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 11, 405–421.

Sahlin-Andersson, K. and Engwall, L. (2002). The expansion of management knowledge: Carriers, flowsand sources. Stanford University Press.

Schalock, R. and Bonham, G. (2003). Measuring outcomes and managing for results. *Evaluation and program planning*, *26*(3), 229-235.

Schofer, E. and Longhofer, W. (2011). The structural sources of association. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*(2): 539-585.

Smith, S. and Grønbjerg, K. (2006). Scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations. *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, *2*, 221-242.

Sowa, J., Selden, S. and Sandfort, J. (2004). No longer unmeasurable? A multidimensional integrated model of nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *33*(4), 711-728.

Stone, M. and Cutcher-Gershenfeld, S. (2002). Challenges of measuring performance in nonprofit organizations. In *Measuring the impact of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 33-57). Springer US.

Trevisan, M. (2007). Evaluability assessment from 1986 to 2006. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28, 290–303.

Wiener, S. J., Kirsch, A. D. and McCormack, M. T. (2002). Balancing the scales: Measuring the roles and contributions of NPOs and religious congregations. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Table 1: Organization characteristics

	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Year founded	182	2007.764	7.950	1956	2016
Central region	182	0.544	0.499	0	1
Western region	182	0.302	0.460	0	1
East region	182	0.429	0.496	0	1
Northern region	182	0.269	0.445	0	1
Budget per year USD	182	89,343	473,370	0	4,571,429
Private funding	182	0.780	0.415	0	1
National donors	182	0.143	0.351	0	1
International donors	182	0.385	0.488	0	1
Permanent employees	182	6.593	7.485	0	59
Temporary employees	182	6.198	13.834	0	110
Volunteers	182	15.599	29.643	0	200
Permanent employees with secondary education	182	5.088	6.185	0	40
Temporary employees with secondary education	182	4.033	8.104	0	50
Permanent employees with tertiary education	182	4.044	6.037	0	40
Temporary employees with tertiary education	182	2.126	5.462	0	40
Employees received any training	182	13.912	31.770	0	225
Directors years of experience at organization	182	7.429	6.252	0	38
Directors years of experience total	182	8.253	6.634	0	38
Cooperate with academics	182	0.478	0.501	0	1
Cooperate with CBOs	182	0.786	0.411	0	1
Partner with private organizations	182	0.159	0.367	0	1
Partner with public organizations	182	0.165	0.372	0	1
Partner with other NGOs	182	0.626	0.485	0	1
Have trained on M&E	182	0.588	0.494	0	1
Organization conducts M&E or IE	182	0.692	0.463	0	1
Has made changes based on an evaluation	182	0.363	0.482	0	1

Table 2: Organization characteristics by M&E and evaluation status

	Conducts M&E or IE	Does not
Year founded	2007.175	2009.089
Central region	0.532	0.571
Western region	0.294	0.321
East region	0.429	0.429
Northern region	0.270	0.268
Budget per year USD	87991.870	92382.140
Private funding	0.770	0.804
National donors	0.183	0.054
International donors	0.413	0.321
Permanent employees	7.762	3.964
Temporary employees	7.619	3.000
Volunteers	15.071	16.786
Permanent employees with secondary education	6.135	2.732
Temporary employees with secondary education	4.762	2.393
Permanent employees with tertiary education	5.024	1.839
Temporary employees with tertiary education	2.421	1.464
Employees received any training	18.000	4.714
Directors years of experience at organization	7.516	7.232
Directors years of experience total	8.643	7.375
Cooperate with academics	0.492	0.446
Cooperate with CBOs	0.810	0.732
Partner with private organizations	0.167	0.143
Partner with public organizations	0.159	0.179
Partner with other NGOs	0.675	0.518
Have trained on M&E	0.698	0.339
Organization conducts M&E or IE	1.000	0.000
Has made changes based on an evaluation	0.484	0.089
Observations	126	56

Table 3: Correlates of learning

	(1)	(2)
	Conducts M&E or IE	Changed program due to M&E or IE
Year founded	-0.011	-0.006
	[0.007]	[0.007]
Central region	0.017	0.016
	[0.070]	[0.071]
Western region	-0.057	-0.059
	[0.077]	[0.078]
East region	-0.025	0.039
	[0.070]	[0.071]
Northern region	-0.042	-0.093
	[0.079]	[0.080]
Budget per year USD	-0.000	0.000*
	[0.000]	[0.000]
Private funding	0.037	-0.136
	[0.094]	[0.095]
National donors	0.220**	-0.127
	[0.103]	[0.106]
International donors	0.046	-0.000
	[0.077]	[0.078]
Permanent employees	-0.014	-0.024*
	[0.012]	[0.013]
Temporary employees	0.004	-0.002
	[0.004]	[0.004]
Volunteers	-0.003**	-0.002
	[0.002]	[0.002]
Permanent employees with secondary education	0.020	0.025*
	[0.013]	[0.013]
Temporary employees with secondary education	0.006	-0.009
	[0.008]	[0.008]
Permanent employees with tertiary education	0.013	0.019*
	[0.010]	[0.010]
Temporary employees with tertiary education	-0.015	0.023**
	[0.010]	[0.010]
Employees received any training	0.002	0.001
	[0.002]	[0.002]
Directors years of experience at organization	-0.023**	-0.000
	[0.010]	[0.011]
Directors years of experience total	0.010	-0.007
	[0.008]	[0.008]
Cooperate with academics	-0.048	0.065
	[0.073]	[0.074]

Cooperate with CBOs	0.064	-0.004
	[0.088]	[0.089]
Partner with private organizations	0.014	0.024
	[0.095]	[0.097]
Partner with public organizations	-0.150	0.053
	[0.097]	[0.099]
Partner with other NGOs	0.042	-0.072
	[0.082]	[0.083]
Have trained on M&E	0.231***	0.071
	[0.071]	[0.074]
		0.319***
		[0.081]
Observations	182	182
R-squared	0.267	0.312

Notes: Standard error in parenthesis. Significance level: p-value 0.01,***; p-value 0.05,**; p-value 0.1,*

Table 4: Methods to conduct monitoring and evaluation

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			External	Internal
	Questionnaires	Interviews	auditors	auditors
Year founded	2006.958	2007.038	2007.491	2007.533
Central region	0.563	0.519	0.547	0.533
Western region	0.268	0.329	0.358	0.267
East region	0.423	0.468	0.491	0.400
Northern region	0.282	0.266	0.245	0.333
Budget per year USD	126916.800	118397.900	62452.130	419934.200
Private funding	0.761	0.785	0.755	0.667
National donors	0.169	0.190	0.189	0.267
International donors	0.437	0.443	0.491	0.667
Permanent employees	7.972	7.949	9.057	10.867
Temporary employees	8.549	6.266	8.943	6.667
Volunteers	17.972	12.190	15.434	9.867
Permanent employees with secondary education	5.972	6.633	7.377	7.733
Temporary employees with secondary education	5.211	4.342	6.509	6.400
Permanent employees with tertiary education	5.225	5.570	6.887	7.533
Temporary employees with tertiary education	2.690	2.241	3.528	3.333
Employees received any training	23.408	13.924	22.755	22.000
Directors years of experience at organization	7.437	7.886	8.170	6.800
Directors years of experience total	8.423	8.709	9.019	6.600
Cooperate with academics	0.521	0.481	0.509	0.400
Cooperate with CBOs	0.887	0.759	0.887	1.000
Partner with private organizations	0.183	0.165	0.132	0.133
Partner with public organizations	0.197	0.127	0.283	0.200
Partner with other NGOs	0.746	0.684	0.660	0.800
Have trained on M&E	0.845	0.658	0.698	0.800
Has made changes based on an evaluation	0.493	0.544	0.604	0.667
Observations	71	79	53	15

Appendix: The survey

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____and I am calling from Gaplink, a research and development firm based in Kampala. We are making this call on behalf of Professor Nathan Fiala from the University of Connecticut in the USA. Are you the director of [NGO NAME]?

[Confirm you are talking to the director of the organization. If it is not the director, ask for the directors contact information. If you have contacted the director, continue.]

If it is okay with you, I would like to request for 15 minutes of your time to ask a few questions about the operations of your NGO. We hope to use this information to organize further interaction with NGOs across Uganda. Your participation is voluntary and anything you say will be kept confidential. I am also happy to call at a time that is more convenient for you. Is it okay to talk now?

SN	Questions	Response
1	Which year was your organization founded?	|__|__|__|__|
2	Does your organization operate locally (one area of Uganda), nationally (multiple areas in Uganda) or internationally (within Uganda and also in other countries)?	a. Local b. National c. International
3	What is your role in this organization?	a. Director/CEO b. Other (specify) _____
4	In what regions in Uganda do you operate? [mark all that apply]	a. Central b. Western c. Eastern d. Northern
5	What kind of programs do you run? Please tell us about all of them. [open ended]	

6	Of your current running programs, how many have a budget of more than 10,000 USD? (34m UGX)	|__|__|
7	Of your current running programs, how many have a budget of less than 10,000 USD? (34m UGX)	|__|__|
8	What is your yearly budget in USH?	|__|__|__|,|__|__|__|,|__|__|__| USH
9	Does your funding come from private, public, national or international sources? [mark all that apply]	a. Private b. Public c. National d. International
10	How many permanent employees did you have in 2015?	|__|__|__|
11	How many temporary or part-time employees did you have in 2015?	|__|__|__|
12	How many volunteers did you have in 2015?	|__|__|__|
13	How many of your permanent employees in 2015 have secondary or higher education?	|__|__|__|
14	How many of your temporary employees in 2015 have secondary or higher education?	|__|__|__|

15	How many of your permanent employees in 2015 have tertiary education or higher?	|__|__|__|
16	How many of your temporary employees in 2015 have tertiary education or higher?	|__|__|__|
17	How many of your permanent employees in 2015 have less than 2 years of experience in this or similar kind of organization?	|__|__|__|
18	How many of your permanent employees in 2015 have more than 5 years of experience in this or similar kind of organization?	|__|__|__|
19	In 2015, how many of your employees (including permanent, temporary and volunteers) received any kind of training in this organization?	|__|__|__|
20	How many times have you personally received any kind of training in this organization?	|__|__|__|
21	How many times have you personally received any kind of training in the previous organizations you have worked for?	|__|__|__|
22	How many years of experience do you have in this specific organization?	|__|__|

23	How many years of experience do you have in this specific position in this or other organizations?	|__|__|
24	How many supervisor positions does this organization have?	|__|__|__|
25	Is your organization cooperating with any academic institutions? By cooperate, I mean coordinating activities, working closely together or participating in research?	a. Yes b. No
26	Is your organization cooperating with any community based organizations?	a. Yes b. No
27	Is your organization cooperating or partnering with any other NGOs or other organizations?	a. Yes b. No [skip to 32]
28	Which kind of institutions are in the partnership? By partnership, I mean coordinating activities, working closely together or participating in meetings together?	a. Private sector b. Public sector c. NGOs d. Other (Specify)
29	Which year was the first time you became a member of any kind of partnership?	|__|__|__|__|

30	How many times in 2015 did you have meetings with other organizations?	|__|__| [if 0, skip to 32]
31	How many of these meetings did your organization organize?	|__|__|
32	Have you personally ever attended any training related to monitoring and evaluation?	a. Yes b. No [skip to 34]
33	Who provided this training?	a. NGOs b. Government c. Foundation d. Internally e. Other
34	Does your organization conduct formal monitoring and evaluation?	a. Yes b. No [skip to 36]
35	Please describe how you conduct M & E. That is, follow up participants, audit money, etc. [open ended response]	
36	How many programs are you currently implementing?	|__|__|

37	On how many of these programs have you conducted some kind of M&E?	|__|__| [if 0, skip to 40]
38	Have you ever changed your programs based on your M&E outcomes?	a. Yes b. No [skip to 40]
39	How did you use the result of an M&E to change your program? [open ended]	
40	Have you ever conducted a formal evaluation of the impact of one of your programs?	a. Yes b. No [skip to 45]
41	How did you evaluate your program? That is, what methods did you use? [open ended]	
42	After the evaluation, did you ever implement the program again?	a. Yes b. No
43	Have you ever changed your programs based on your impact evaluation results?	a. Yes b. No
44	How did you use the result of an evaluation to change your program? [open ended]	

45	Would you be interested in receiving a training on M&E? It would be a two day training and we would ask that the director of your organization and someone from your M&E or program team join. We will provide a per diem for your meals and accommodation.	a. Yes b. No [end]
46	Where would you prefer to have this training done?	a. Kampala b. Other _____