

**Impact of Monitoring and Evaluation on the Management of Patient
Records and Health Care Delivery
(a Comparative Study of Lagos University Teaching Hospital and
Mushin General Hospital Oliyide)**

Omole, Michael Segun, Ph.D

School of Health Information Management, Osun State College of Health Technology, Ilesa,
Nigeria

Muideen Babatunde Olatunji

Executive Secretary, Oyo State Primary Healthcare Board

Temesgen Atsedu Demeke (AAU, KeMU)

Consultant, WHO WCO Nigeria, South West Zone, Ibadan

Kayode Sunday Osundina

Adeleke University Ede Osun State Health Information Management Department

Samuel Omowale Okijiola

Department of Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Public Health, University of Ibadan

Ayinde, Taiwo Oluwasun

University of Ibadan

Abstract: Introduction: Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices play a crucial role in shaping the efficiency and effectiveness of healthcare systems. This study compares the understanding and implementation of M&E in two prominent Nigerian healthcare institutions, Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH). With an increasing emphasis on data-driven decision-making in healthcare, evaluating the impact of M&E practices is essential for improving patient outcomes and healthcare service quality.

Objective: The study aims to assess the awareness, knowledge, and implementation of M&E practices among healthcare professionals in LUTH and MGH. Additionally, it explores the impact of M&E on patient records management and the efficiency of health information managers in both institutions.

Methods of Analysis: A comparative research design was employed, involving a total of 150 participants from the Health Information Management departments of LUTH and MGH. Structured questionnaires were administered, and the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, and comparative figures to highlight significant differences.

Results: The study reveals substantial awareness levels in both hospitals: 93.3% in LUTH and 94% in MGH. Chi-square tests show significant associations between M&E practices and the efficiency of health information managers: LUTH ($p=0.04$) and MGH ($p=0.02$). Furthermore,

69.6% of LUTH respondents and 75.0% of MGH respondents agreed that M&E enhanced healthcare services.

Conclusion: The study underscores the pivotal role of M&E practices in healthcare management. Both hospitals exhibit a profound understanding of M&E, demonstrating its positive influence on healthcare services and patient record management.

Recommendation: Healthcare institutions should conduct regular training sessions to enhance professionals' M&E knowledge and skills. Implementation of integrated M&E systems across departments is crucial, and continuous evaluations are necessary to adapt to evolving healthcare needs and technological advancements.

Keywords: Monitoring and Evaluation, Healthcare Management, Patient Records, Health Information Management, Data-driven Decision-making.

Background

The global healthcare sector has long grappled with challenges stemming from patient dissatisfaction due to inadequate healthcare services, primarily attributed to poor monitoring and evaluation practices (Adindu, 2017). Despite substantial government allocations to healthcare, the absence of effective monitoring and evaluation tools raises concerns about the quality and effectiveness of healthcare services provided (World Health Reports, 2016). In developed countries, monitoring and evaluation have become indispensable for assessing healthcare quality, highlighting the disparity between resource allocation and efficient patient care management (Adindu, 2018).

Efficient healthcare delivery not only results in better health outcomes but also reduces disparities and unnecessary expenditures, such as avoidable emergency room visits and hospital care (McCoy et al., 2015). However, healthcare practitioners often struggle to implement comprehensive monitoring and evaluation practices, leading to a lack of comprehensive assessment of healthcare delivery systems (McCoy et al., 2015). These challenges underscore the need for a thorough study, as conducted in selected healthcare centers in Lagos, focusing on healthcare practitioners' knowledge, the extent of implementation, and the impact of monitoring and evaluation on patient records management.

Monitoring and evaluation serve as essential tools in ensuring that healthcare services align with desired goals and outcomes, providing valuable information to guide present and future decisions in healthcare planning and implementation (Adindu, 2017; Adindu, 2018). These processes assess the relevance of health services, measure progress during implementation, and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of healthcare interventions, addressing weaknesses and enhancing strengths (McDonnell, Wilson, and Goodacre, 2016). However, the healthcare sector faces challenges in generating high-quality data to track health progress and ensure accountability, especially amid increased international funding (WHO, 2019). Disparities among healthcare facilities and the challenges faced by healthcare practitioners hinder the effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation practices, leading to neglect of this crucial aspect, which impacts both healthcare facilities and patients (McCoy et al., 2015).

In the specific context of this study, which focused on two healthcare institutions in Lagos: Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital Oliyide, The research aims to assess the knowledge of healthcare practitioners regarding M&E, examine the extent of M&E practices, determine the impact of M&E on patient records management, and identify factors hindering effective M&E in these institutions. The findings of this research are crucial not only for improving the quality of healthcare delivery but also for enhancing the accountability and transparency of healthcare services to stakeholders, ultimately leading to better health outcomes for patients and communities.

Research Hypothesis

H₀: There is no significance relationship existing between Monitoring and Evaluation and Patient Records Management

H₁: There is a significance relationship existing between Monitoring and Evaluation and Patient Records Management

Methods

Study Area

Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) stands as one of Nigeria's foremost tertiary healthcare institutions, located in Idi-Araba, Lagos. Founded in 1962, LUTH serves as a hub for medical education, patient care, and research. It plays a vital role in the Nigerian healthcare system, offering a wide array of specialized medical services, including surgeries, diagnostics, and treatments for various diseases. LUTH operates with a commitment to providing high-quality healthcare services, medical training, and innovative research initiatives. Within LUTH, one of the pivotal departments that plays a crucial role in the management of patient records and healthcare data is the Health Information Management Department. This department serves as the backbone for information and data management within the hospital. Health Information Management professionals in this department are responsible for various critical tasks, including the collection, organization, analysis, and secure maintenance of patient records and health-related data. The Health Information Management Department at LUTH ensures that healthcare records are accurately documented and readily accessible for healthcare providers, enabling efficient patient care. It plays a pivotal role in maintaining the integrity and confidentiality of patient information, adhering to ethical and legal standards.

While Mushin General Hospital Oliyide, located in Mushin, Lagos State, Nigeria, has served as a vital healthcare institution for several decades. Evolving over the years, it has become a cornerstone of healthcare delivery in the Mushin community, addressing diverse medical needs. The Health Information Management Department within the hospital plays a pivotal role. It manages patient records and healthcare information, transitioning from paper-based to electronic health records (EHR). Professionals here organize and safeguard patient data, ensuring accuracy, confidentiality, and accessibility. They contribute to administrative processes, research, and healthcare planning, aiding in medical research and quality improvement initiatives. This department's expertise enhances the hospital's effectiveness in delivering high-quality patient care.

Research Design

The study employed a comparative research design to assess the influence of monitoring and evaluation on health records management. This choice was made purposefully, ensuring the precise collection of factual information to effectively describe the existing phenomena under investigation.

Study Population

The population consists of health information management professionals in the study area; Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital Oliyide (MGH).

Sampling technique and Sample Size

All members of the Health Information Management department at Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Idi-Araba, Lagos State, and all members of the Health Information Management department at Mushin General Hospital Oliyide were considered for the study. A total enumeration method was adopted for the study, which encompassed all individuals within the

Health Information Management departments of both Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Idi-Araba, Lagos State, and General Hospital Oluyide. The sample size comprised 150 participants.

Data Collection and Management

A standardized structured questionnaire was utilized to gather data, which was distributed among health records personnel and later retrieved upon completion. This questionnaire was thoughtfully designed to address the objectives and issues outlined in chapter one. It was structured into four sections, which allowed for a comprehensive examination of the research questions and enabled the researcher to draw conclusions and provide recommendations. The questionnaire contained both open-ended and close-ended questions. The questionnaire was directly administered to the respondents, filled out by them, and the raw data collected. This data was subsequently analyzed using descriptive statistics, which included mean, standard deviation, frequency tables, and frequencies. The analysis was conducted with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. Additionally, inferential statistics, such as the Chi-square test, were employed to evaluate the postulated hypotheses using specific questions from the questionnaire.

Ethical considerations

In conducting this study, ethical principles and guidelines were strictly adhered to. The confidentiality and privacy of the participants were paramount throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring they were fully aware of the study's purpose, procedures, and potential implications. Participants were assured of their voluntary participation and the option to withdraw from the study at any point without facing any consequences. Additionally, their responses were anonymized and aggregated, preserving their identities. Furthermore, the research was conducted in compliance with institutional guidelines and ethical standards, emphasizing the responsible and respectful treatment of participants. The findings and conclusions drawn from the study were presented objectively, ensuring the integrity and credibility of the research process.

Results

Table 1; Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents

Characteristics	LUTH		MGH	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Age(years)				
21-30	36	48.0	39	52.0
31-40	33	44.0	33	44.0
41-50	6	8.0	9	12.0
51-60	0	0.0	3	4.0
Sex				
Male	16	21.3	16	21.3
Female	59	78.7	59	78.7
Marital status				
Single	35	46.7	40	53.3
Married	30	40.0	30	40.0
Others	10	13.3	5	6.7
Religion				
Christainaity	49	65.3	45	60.0
Islam	16	21.3	24	32.0
Others	10	13.3	6	8.0
Tribe				
Yoruba	49	65.3	37	49.3
Igbo	11	14.7	18	24.0

Hausa	15	20.0	20	26.7
Years in service				
≤10 years	36	14.7	45	60.0
11-20 years	33	20.0	18	24.0
≥21 years	6	48.0	12	16.0
Level of education				
Primary	13	17.3	10	13.3
Secondary	16	21.3	30	40.0
Tertiary	46	61.3	35	46.7

Table 1 presents sociodemographic data for respondents from Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH). In terms of age, the majority of respondents in both hospitals were aged 21-40 years, with 48.0% in LUTH and 52.0% in MGH falling within this range. Female respondents constituted the majority in both hospitals, accounting for 78.7% in both LUTH and MGH. Regarding marital status, a higher percentage of respondents were single in both hospitals, with 46.7% in LUTH and 53.3% in MGH. In terms of religion, Christianity was the predominant faith in both hospitals, with 65.3% in LUTH and 60.0% in MGH. Yoruba was the most common tribe in both hospitals, comprising 65.3% in LUTH and 49.3% in MGH. When considering years in service, a significant proportion of respondents in LUTH had over 20 years of experience (48.0%), while in MGH, a higher percentage had 10 years or less of service (60.0%). Regarding education, the majority of respondents in both hospitals had tertiary-level education, accounting for 61.3% in LUTH and 46.7% in MGH.

Table 2: Respondents Knowledge On Monitoring and Evaluation.

Questions	LUTH		MGH	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Have you heard of Monitoring and Evaluation?				
Yes	70	93.3	69	92.0
No	5	6.7	6	8.0
If yes, where did you hear of Monitoring and Evaluation?				
School	49	65.3	40	58.0
At work	10	14.3	20	29.0
Television	10	14.3	7	10.1
Social media	1	1.4	2	2.9
Monitoring is a process of collecting, processing, and analyzing health data and indicators, confirming activities and actions.				
Yes	52	69.3	53	70.7
No	16	21.3	22	29.3
I don't know	7	9.3	0	0
Evaluation is the judgment of an intervention or any of its components aiming at helping decision-making processes.				
Yes	65	86.7	60	80.0
No	10	13.3	10	13.3
I don't know	0	0	5	6.7
Monitoring and evaluation are essential management tools ensuring that health activities are implemented as planned.				
Yes	54	72.0	52	69.3
No	14	18.7	18	24.0
I don't know	7	9.3	5	6.7

Table 2 presents the knowledge of respondents from Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH) regarding monitoring and evaluation. The majority of respondents in both hospitals have heard of monitoring and evaluation, with 93.3% in LUTH and 92.0% in MGH acknowledging awareness. Among those who have heard of it, the primary sources of knowledge were school for 65.3% in LUTH and 58.0% in MGH, followed by learning about it at work, on television, and through social media. Respondents demonstrated an understanding of monitoring as a process of collecting, processing, and analyzing health data and indicators, confirming activities and actions, with 69.3% in LUTH and 70.7% in MGH correctly identifying this definition. Similarly, the majority recognized evaluation as the judgment of an intervention or its components to aid decision-making processes, with 86.7% in LUTH and 80.0% in MGH providing accurate responses. Furthermore, respondents acknowledged the importance of monitoring and evaluation as essential management tools for ensuring that health activities are implemented as planned. In LUTH, 72.0% of respondents recognized this, while in MGH, 69.3% held a similar view. In summary, the majority of respondents in both hospitals have heard of monitoring and evaluation, and there is a clear understanding of their definitions and importance in healthcare management.

Table 3 : Practice of Monitoring and Evaluation

Questions	LUTH		MGH	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Do you practice monitoring and evaluation in the hospital?				
Yes	70	93.3	69	94
No	5	6.7	6	6
If yes, how often do you practice it?				
Weekly	26	37.1	10	14.5
Monthly	40	57.1	49	71.0
Quarterly	4	5.7	10	14.5
Is there a plan that guides monitoring and evaluation in the hospital?				
Yes	45	60.0	45	60.0
No	22	29.0	15	20.0
Not sure	8	11.0	15	20.0
If yes, is the plan very effective/consistent?				
Yes	53	71.0	45	60.0
No	16	21.0	22	29.0
Not sure	6	8.0	8	11.0
How do you disseminate monitoring and evaluation findings?				
On the board				
Newsletter	10	13.0	26	35.0
Report to LGA	59	79.0	25	34.0
No dissemination	2	1.9	12	16.0
	5	5.0	12	16.0
What method do you adopt in collecting monitoring and evaluation data?				
Questionnaire	9	12.0	15	20.0
Interviews	11	15.0	15	20.0
Observation	56	75.0	41	55.0
NHIMs	8	11.0	8	11.0
Others	1	1.0	6	8.0

In both Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH), the majority of respondents, 93.3% in LUTH and 94% in MGH, reported practicing monitoring and evaluation in the hospital. Among those practicing, 57.1% in LUTH and 71% in MGH conducted evaluations monthly, while 10% in LUTH and 14.5% in MGH conducted them quarterly. Regarding the existence of a guiding plan, 60% of respondents in both hospitals indicated the presence of such a plan. In terms of effectiveness, 71% in LUTH and 60% in MGH perceived the plan as very effective/consistent. The findings were disseminated mainly through newsletters in LUTH (79%) and both newsletters and reports to local government authorities in MGH (34% and 16%, respectively). The predominant method for collecting monitoring and evaluation data was observation, with 75% in LUTH and 55% in MGH opting for this approach. (Table 3)

Table 4: Impact and Effect of Monitoring and Evaluation

Questions	LUTH		MGH	
	Freq.	%	Freq	%
Has the use of Monitoring & Evaluation enhanced healthcare services towards patient treatment?	16	69.6	15	75.0
Yes	4	17.4	4	20.0
No	3	13.0	1	5.0
I don't know				
Has Monitoring & Evaluation brought about efficient means of health records documentation and management?	16	69.6	13	65.0
Yes	4	17.4	5	25.0
No	3	13.0	2	10.0
I don't know				
Has the use of Monitoring & Evaluation contributed to the efficiency of health information managers in the management of patient records?	12	52.2	12	60.0
Yes	9	39.1	2	10.0
No	2	8.7	1	5.0
I don't know				
How effectively has Monitoring & Evaluation helped to improve quality healthcare delivery in the hospital?	5	21.7	3	15.0
Less effective	18	78.3	12	60.0
More effective	0	0.0	5	25.0
Undecided				
Are there factors militating against effective Monitoring & Evaluation of healthcare delivery?	17	73.9	12	60.0
Yes	3	13.0	6	30.0
No	3	13.0	2	10.0
I don't know				
Does Monitoring & Evaluation help to compare performance level with standards and norms?	18	78.3	15	75.0
Yes	5	21.7	4	20.0
No	0	0.0	1	5.0
I don't know				
Does Monitoring & Evaluation help to measure the level of performance at your workplace?	14	60.9	10	50.0
Yes	6	26.1	8	40.0
No	3	13.0	2	10.0
I don't know				

The impact and effect of Monitoring and Evaluation in healthcare services were assessed at Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH). At LUTH, 69.6% of respondents indicated that Monitoring and Evaluation enhanced healthcare services, while 17.4% were unsure, and 13.0% disagreed. Similarly, at MGH, 75.0% agreed, 20.0% disagreed, and 5.0% were unsure. Regarding the efficiency of health records documentation and management, 69.6% of LUTH respondents affirmed the positive impact of Monitoring and Evaluation, with 17.4% disagreeing and 13.0% being unsure. At MGH, 65.0% agreed, 25.0% disagreed, and 10.0% were unsure. In terms of the contribution to the efficiency of health information managers, 52.2% of respondents at LUTH agreed, while 39.1% disagreed, and 8.7% were unsure. At MGH, 60.0% agreed, 10.0% disagreed, and 5.0% were unsure. Regarding the effectiveness in improving quality healthcare delivery, 21.7% at LUTH felt it was less effective, 78.3% found it more effective, and 0.0% were undecided. Meanwhile, at MGH, 15.0% considered it less effective, 60.0% found it more effective, and 25.0% were undecided. Concerning factors hindering effective Monitoring and Evaluation, 73.9% at LUTH identified obstacles, while 13.0% believed there were none, and 13.0% were unsure. At MGH, 60.0% identified obstacles, 30.0% did not, and 10.0% were unsure. Regarding the comparison of performance with standards and norms, 78.3% at LUTH agreed, 21.7% disagreed, and 0.0% were unsure. At MGH, 75.0% agreed, 20.0% disagreed, and 5.0% were unsure. Lastly, when assessing the ability to measure performance at the workplace, 60.9% at LUTH agreed, 26.1% disagreed, and 13.0% were unsure. At MGH, 50.0% agreed, 40.0% disagreed, and 10.0% were unsure.(Table 4)

Table 5: Association between the use of monitoring and evaluation contributed to the efficiency of health information managers and the management of patient records (LUTH).

		Use of monitoring and evaluation contributed to the efficiency of health LUTH			Total	Df	P-value
		Yes	No	I dont know			
The management of patient records	Yes	60(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	60(100.0%)	4	0.04
	No	10(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	10(100.0%)		
	I dont know	2(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	3(100.0%)	5(100.0%)		
Total		72(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	3(0.0%)	75(100.0%)		

Table 5 presents the association between the use of monitoring and evaluation and its contribution to the efficiency of health information managers in managing patient records at Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH). Among those who affirmed the use of monitoring and evaluation, 60 individuals (100.0%) agreed that it contributed to the efficiency of health information managers, while none disagreed. In contrast, among those who were unsure about the use of monitoring and evaluation, 3 individuals (100.0%) felt it contributed to the efficiency of health information managers. The association was statistically significant with a p-value of 0.04, indicating a strong relationship between the use of monitoring and evaluation and its positive impact on the efficiency of health information managers in managing patient records at LUTH.

Table 6: Association between the use of monitoring and evaluation contributed to the efficiency of health information managers and the management of patient records (MGH).

		Use of monitoring and evaluation contributed to the efficiency of health MGH			Total	Df	P-value
		Yes	No	I don't know			
the management of patient records	Yes	65(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	65(100.0%)	4	0.02
	No	7(100.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	7(100.0%)		
	I don't know	1(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	2(100.0%)	3(100.0%)		
Total		22(51.9%)	0(0.0%)	2(0.0%)	75(100.0%)		

Table 6 above illustrates the association between the use of monitoring and evaluation and its impact on the efficiency of health information managers in managing patient records at Mushin General Hospital (MGH). Among those who acknowledged the use of monitoring and evaluation, 65 individuals (100.0%) believed it contributed to the efficiency of health information managers, while none disagreed. For those who were uncertain about the use of monitoring and evaluation, 2 individuals (100.0%) thought it contributed to the efficiency of health information managers. The association was statistically significant with a p-value of 0.02, indicating a strong correlation between the use of monitoring and evaluation and its positive impact on the efficiency of health information managers in managing patient records at MGH.

Discussion

The comparison between Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH) highlights the widespread recognition and understanding of monitoring and evaluation practices among healthcare professionals. At LUTH, 93.3% of respondents were aware of monitoring and evaluation, with the majority practicing it regularly, emphasizing its integral role in healthcare management. Similarly, at MGH, 94% of respondents acknowledged the importance of monitoring and evaluation, indicating a shared understanding of its significance. Both hospitals demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of monitoring and evaluation definitions, with a vast majority recognizing its impact on healthcare services. This is however consistent with previous studies (Nkanata et al 2013; Ayangbekun and Oke 2013; Akinlami 2013, Krishnan et al 2010; Danso 2015; Gyork, 2003)

In terms of age demographics, both hospitals primarily consisted of respondents aged 21-40 years, reflecting the prevalence of younger professionals in the field. Female respondents dominated both institutions, constituting 78.7% in both LUTH and MGH. Similar finding was reported in Ethiopia by Ajabajel et al (2011). Analysis also showed that the health records personnel are mostly women in both health facilities, similar to a previous study (Ancker et al 2012) in Enugu in 2008 where the records staffs were predominantly women. This would suggest the dominance of women in data collection. Women are generally known to be participatory, dutiful and culturally competent (Akinlami 2013, Krishnan et al 2010).

When evaluating the impact of monitoring and evaluation, the majority of respondents in both hospitals recognized its positive influence on healthcare services and health information management. At LUTH, 69.6% believed that monitoring and evaluation enhanced healthcare services, and 69.6% acknowledged its impact on efficient health records documentation. This is consistent with a study by IFRC 2001 where it was stated that's effective monitoring and evaluation has positive impact on health records documentation. Additionally, 52.2% recognized its contribution to the efficiency of health information managers. In MGH, a higher percentage, 75.0%, agreed that monitoring and evaluation enhanced healthcare services, and 65.0% acknowledged its role in efficient health records documentation. Moreover, 60.0% recognized its contribution to the efficiency of health information managers. This is in line with a study by

Danso (2015) and Gyorks (2003), where majority of the participants reported that M& E has impacted the efficiency of their management system positively.

The comparison between Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH) reveals a significant correlation between the use of monitoring and evaluation practices and the efficiency of health information managers in managing patient records. At LUTH, 60 individuals (100.0%) affirmed that monitoring and evaluation contributed to efficiency, while 3 individuals (100.0%) who were uncertain also perceived its positive impact. Similarly, at MGH, 65 individuals (100.0%) who acknowledged monitoring and evaluation believed it enhanced efficiency, and 2 individuals (100.0%) who were unsure shared the same sentiment. The results demonstrate a strong association, with a p-value of 0.04 for LUTH and 0.02 for MGH, underscoring the positive influence of monitoring and evaluation on health information managers' efficiency in both hospitals. This however is consistent with the findings of similar studies who reported strong association between use of monitoring and evaluation practices and efficiency of health information manager (Nkanata et al 2013; Ayangbekun and Oke 2013; Akinlami 2013; Krishnan et al 2010)

In summary, both Lagos University Teaching Hospital and Mushin General Hospital exhibited a shared understanding and recognition of monitoring and evaluation practices, emphasizing their positive impact on healthcare services, health information management, and performance evaluation. The consistent findings across both institutions highlight the widespread acceptance of these practices among healthcare professionals, reinforcing their integral role in ensuring efficient healthcare delivery and management.

Conclusion

The comparison between Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH) and Mushin General Hospital (MGH) illuminates a shared recognition and understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluation practices among healthcare professionals. Both hospitals demonstrated a robust awareness of monitoring and evaluation, with a majority of respondents practicing it regularly. This consistency in understanding emphasizes the integral role of monitoring and evaluation in healthcare management and service delivery, aligning with existing studies in the field. Moreover, the positive impact of monitoring and evaluation on healthcare services, health information management, and the efficiency of health information managers was evident in both hospitals. The findings underscore the essential nature of these practices in optimizing healthcare systems, ensuring accurate documentation, and enhancing the efficiency of healthcare professionals.

Recommendations

1. **Continuous Training and Awareness Programs:** Hospitals should invest in continuous training and awareness programs focused on monitoring and evaluation practices. These programs should target healthcare professionals at all levels, emphasizing the importance of accurate data collection, evaluation techniques, and the utilization of monitoring and evaluation results in decision-making processes.
2. **Implementation of Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:** Hospitals should consider implementing integrated monitoring and evaluation systems that are streamlined across departments. This integration would facilitate seamless data collection, analysis, and dissemination of findings, ensuring that healthcare professionals can efficiently utilize the data for improved patient care and management.

By prioritizing ongoing education and integrating monitoring and evaluation practices into the core of healthcare operations, hospitals can further enhance their efficiency, ultimately leading to improved patient outcomes and overall healthcare service quality.

References

1. Adeleke, I. T., Adekanye, A. O., Onawola, K. A., Okuku, A. G., Adefemi, S. A., Erinle, S. A., ... & AbdulGhaney, O. O. (2012). Data quality assessment in healthcare: a 365-day chart review of inpatients' health records at a Nigerian tertiary hospital. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(6), 1039-1042.
2. Ajabajel et al. (2011). Community empowerment; a participatory training manual on community project development. PACT publication.
3. Akinlami Baba (2013). Record Keeping by Anaesthetist in a Developing Country. *Afrimedical Journal*, 4 (1), 29-31.
4. Danso A deiye (2015). Direction in development: evaluating the impact of development projects on poverty. A handbook for practitioners. *The World Bank*, Washington D.C.
5. Gyorko T. L(2003). Logical framework approach and PRA – mutually exclusive or complementary tools for planning? *Journal of Development in Practice*, 10(5), 687-690.
6. Krishnan et al. (2010). The origins of Primary Health Care and selective Primary Health Care. *American Journal of Public Health*, 22(94), 1864–1874.
7. McCoy, L., Ngari, P., & Krumpe, E. (2005). Building Monitoring, Evaluations and Reporting Systems for HIV/AIDS programmes. Washington DC: USAID.
8. McDonnell, A., Wilson, R., & Goodacre, S. (2006). Evaluating and implementing new services. *British Medical Journal. West Africa Edition*, 9(2), 102-104.
9. Nkanata, Mercy Gacheri; Makori, Elisha Ondieki; & Irura, Grace (2018). Comparative Analysis of Hospital Information Management Systems among Healthcare Workers in Two Selected Hospitals in Kenya. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 2056.
10. Oluwafemi, J., Ayangbekun, & Ameenah, Oke (2014). Comparative Analysis of Existing Health Information Systems for the Development of Nigerian Health Sector. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer and Communication Engineering*, 2, 4981-4989.
11. World Health Organization (2019). Declaration of Alma-Ata. Adopted at the International Conference on Primary Health Care, Alma-Ata, USSR, 6–12 September 1978. Retrieved from [www.who.int/healthinfo/HSS M and E framework](http://www.who.int/healthinfo/HSS_M_and_E_framework) Nov, 2019.
12. World Health Organization (2012). Baseline assessment of the Nigerian pharmaceutical sector. Geneva, Switzerland.